

The Classical Review

APRIL 1887.

THE LATE MASTER OF TRINITY AS A PLATONIC SCHOLAR.

ONE reflection can hardly have failed to suggest itself to any one who has tried to estimate Thompson's classical work; that is to say, that, in bulk at least, the tangible printed result of it is strangely small—small as compared not merely with the ample achievements of German industry, but with the performance of such English scholars as Munro or Conington. As the fruit of a long life and of abundant leisure we have editions of two among Plato's dialogues, a few essays contributed to classical periodicals, and the notes to Archer Butler's lectures: the whole indeed might be bound together in a single volume of moderate size. But no greater mistake could be made than to estimate by the extent of these writings either their intrinsic importance or the activity of the mind which produced them. For if Thompson has written little, every line of that little tells. Nowhere will the reader meet with a hasty or a purposeless sentence: not a word but has passed the test of perhaps the most fastidious judgment that the present generation of scholars has seen. All who were ever associated with him in examining the work of others learnt to appreciate the searching and subtle discernment with which the Master sorted the chaff from the wheat: but however severe might be the standard which he applied to the performance of other men, it falls far short of that by which he tested his own. Accordingly we have in his published writings the very best work which could be given us by a singularly clear and acute intellect, fortified by wide and varied study. And however much we may regret that years of feeble health have left the sum of it so small, yet we could hardly wish it increased by any relaxation of the author's critical austerity.

The paper on the *Sophist* was originally published in the *Cambridge Philosophical Transactions*, and is reprinted in volume

NO. II. VOL. I.

VIII of the *Journal of Philology*, preceded by an apology for its reappearance which few readers will consider necessary. This is a reply to an article of Dr. Whewell's in which the Platonic authorship of the *Sophist* and *Politicus* was impugned. At the present day perhaps no serious student of Plato, in this country at least, will be found to assail the authenticity of these dialogues: but when Thompson's apology was written, this was far from being the case. The attack, which some German scholars, notably Socher, had begun, was enforced by all the reputation and controversial vigour of Dr. Whewell, and the appearance of so able an advocate for the defence was proportionally opportune. The prevalence of the view adopted by Whewell would, at least in the opinion of the present writer, have exercised an effect upon the study of Plato and of Greek philosophy little short of paralysing; while nothing could be more stimulating to such study than Thompson's mode of defence. The essay upon the *Sophist* is not only a cogent vindication of the genuineness of the dialogue, but the first really serious effort (in English at least) to assign to it its due position among the Platonic writings and to survey its relations to other dialogues. The *Sophist* is handled, not as one of a collection of miscellaneous essays, each of which treats its subject or subjects from a point of view which varies with the author's humour, but as forming part of a body of philosophical teaching which possesses a definite aim and significance. In this spirit we see the Platonic method of logical division examined and elucidated, appraised both in its intrinsic importance and in relation to the Platonic system, and surveyed in its bearings upon earlier and contemporary Greek thought. The several subjects treated in the dialogue are co-ordinated with a clearness which must have been a revelation to those who had studied the work only with such light as

D

Stallbaum sheds upon it. And not the least instructive part of the dissertation is that in which the writer insists upon the necessity that the student of Plato shall be keenly on the watch for those perpetually recurring allusions to contemporary or previous thinkers, which, in proportion as they are perceived or missed, go far to determine the apprehension or misapprehension of a whole dialogue. For however fully this may now be recognised, Thompson was probably the first to set it in a clear light. All is done with the ease and sureness of touch which betoken the true master of his subject: even in details where we may not accept his conclusions, we feel no less powerfully the suggestiveness of his method. The essay in fact remains a model of the spirit and manner in which Plato should be studied.

The 'Introductory Remarks' on the *Philebus*, originally prepared for a course of lectures in 1855, were first printed in 1882 (*Journal of Philology*, vol. xi.). This, considered in relation to the dialogue with which it is concerned, is really but a fragment. But, although it cannot be regarded as equal in importance to the defence of the *Sophist*, the work is of the same high order of excellence. There is the same literary finish, the same lucidity in following up the intricate meanderings of this difficult work, and above all the same firm grasp of Plato's position in the history of philosophy. Plato's attitude towards his forerunners and contemporaries has probably never been better described than at the beginning of this essay:—'It is characteristic of Plato's philosophical genius that he is ever seeking for truths amid heaps of seeming error—ever trying to detach the gold from the dross, and to recast it in the mould of his own comprehensive system. . . . He seems to have made it matter of conscience to acquaint himself with whatever had been written before, and whatever was published during his own life, by anyone pretending to the name of sophist or philosopher. And he was not only the most comprehensive, but all appearances to the contrary notwithstanding, one of the most candid of readers. There were in fact very few—I doubt if there was more than one—of his more considerable opponents, with whom he does not to a certain extent agree; or more than one to some portion of whose speculations he has not assigned its due place in his own philosophical structure.' Compare these sayings with the spirit in which Grote approaches (for example) the question be-

tween Plato and Protagoras, and the contrast between the two methods needs no further illustration: nor, one would think, can there be much doubt which method is the more philosophical. In a similar vein is the treatment of the problem concerning the 'One and the Many' a little later on. The whole essay in fact, like that on the *Sophist*, is throughout stimulating and suggestive.

A review of works so well known to Platonic students as the editions of the *Phaedrus* and the *Gorgias* were as superfluous as unsuitable to the compass of the present article. As might be expected in his most carefully matured writings, we find here all the highest qualities of Thompson's work. In lucidity of exposition, in aptness of illustration, in the ease and grace of the translations, these two commentaries will well hold their own with any which could be brought into comparison with them. Indeed we should have far to seek for a combination of accurate scholarship, logical acumen, and literary excellence, similar to that which is presented to us in these volumes. Some perhaps might be disposed to complain of an occasional tendency to discursiveness, natural to a more leisurely style of scholarship than that characteristic of the present day: but if the editor is not always eager to say his say in the fewest possible words, he never loses sight of the point nor intrudes irrelevant matter. Nor is there any display of knowledge for its own sake. Thompson carried his learning lightly: the knowledge he had acquired lay easily upon his mind and did not crave continual escape on paper. The reader of his commentaries is impressed sooner by his taste, judgment, and scholarship than by his learning; yet none but a learned man could have written the commentaries: only we have, as it were, the distilled spirit of his knowledge rather than the crude materials.

As interpretations of the two dialogues these editions are not likely to be soon superseded. Besides the skilful treatment of difficulties in detail, the general drift and arrangement of the two works is handled in a manner no less original than masterly. Both in the *Gorgias* and in the more difficult *Phaedrus*, one feels that the editor has a perfectly definite conception of the course and development of the discussion; we are never left to drift with the current, ὥσπερ τὰ ἀνεμώτα πλοῖα: our pilot knows his bearings. And again the dialogues are not treated as isolated disquisitions, but as integral parts of the Platonic system. Specially instructive and

interesting are the two appendices on the 'Erotic discourses of Socrates,' and 'The philosophy of Isocrates.'

In fine, the permanent value of Thompson's work as a Platonic scholar is to be found not in its extent, which is but moderate, nor altogether in the amount of positive instruction, great as that unquestionably is, which may be derived from it; but in the example he has left of an original and powerful mind dealing with the most fruitful literature of all time. It has been said, and said most truly, that Plato is his own best interpreter: but he will interpret only to him who has 'eyes in his soul.' And for clearing and strengthening this mental vision, there could not be a much

better discipline than following the treatment of the philosopher's works by one whose insight into his spirit has hardly been surpassed. Thompson was in his element as an exponent of Plato. No other author could have given such full scope to the fastidious and subtle taste, to the clear logical thought, to the erudition free from any shadow of pedantry, which are characteristic of the Master of Trinity's work; nor have afforded occasion for so successful a combination of all the most solid qualities of learning and scholarship with a charm of style which gives these writings, apart from their didactic value, a claim to rank as English literature.

R. D. ARCHER-HIND.

THE AEOLIC ELEMENT IN THE *ILIAD* AND *ODYSSEY*.

Die Homerische Odyssee in der ursprünglichen Sprachform wiederhergestellt von AUGUST FICK. Göttingen, 1883.

Die Homerische Ilias nach ihrer Entstehung betrachtet und in der ursprünglichen Sprachform wiederhergestellt von AUGUST FICK. Göttingen, 1885-6.

Philologus, xliii. 1. Dr. K. Sittl, 'Die Aolismen der Homerischen Sprache.' 'Herr Dr. Karl Sittl und die Homerischen Aolismen,' von DR. GUSTAV HINRICHS. Berlin, 1884.

Bezenberger's *Beiträge zur Kunde der Indogerm. Sprachen*. Vol. xi. 'Die Sprachform der altonischen und altattischen Lyrik.' A. FICK.

THE peculiar structure of the Homeric dialect has been explained in two ways, viz. (1) as the result of a fusion of earlier Aeolic ingredients with the Ionic dialect, (2) as a combination of earlier and later forms alike belonging to the Ionic dialect at different stages of its growth. The former view was long accepted without question, and the Aeolic element was magnified in accordance with the prevailing idea, that the Aeolic dialect was once common to nearly all Greece—an inference derived from Strabo and other writers, according to whom the whole country was at first 'Aeolian,' except the distinctively Dorian and Ionian districts. On this supposition everything which appeared archaic in the Homeric language was termed an 'Aeolism.' Recent writers of such authority as Meister and Hinrichs,

while carefully distinguishing between Aeolic and merely archaic forms, admit a considerable residuum of the former, comprising the pronouns *ἄμμες*, *ἄμμι*, *ἄμμε*, *ἔμμες*, *ἔμμι*, *ἔμμε*, the adverbs *ἄμνδης* and *ἄλλνδης*, *ἕα* for *δια* in *ἕαθεος*, *ἕατρεφής*, *ἕακοτος*, &c., the suffix *-ενο* for *-ενο* (*εο-ενο*), e.g. *ἀργεννός*, *ἐρεβεννός*, the vocalisation of the digamma in *αἰῶαροι* (*ἀφῶαροι*), *αἰέροντα* (*ἀφῆροντα*), *εἰαδε* (*εσφαδε*). Meister (*Die Griechischen Dialecte*, p. 19) holds with Hinrichs that 'the origin of these Aeolisms must be sought in the oldest epic poems which appeared on Aeolian soil, probably in Lesbos.' He does not doubt that among the predecessors of Sappho and Alcaeus were Aeolian poets who, before Homer, had celebrated the heroes of the Trojan war.

Hinrichs has recently restated and defended the conclusions embodied in his work (*De Homericæ elocutionis vestigiis Aeolicis*) against an attack by K. Sittl (*Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, ch. ii. pp. 34-44, and *Philologus* xliii. 1, p. 1-31), who has attempted to disprove the whole, or nearly the whole, of the supposed Homeric Aeolisms.¹ In reference to the instances just quoted, he maintains that *ἄλλνδης* and *ἄμνδης*, though not actually found in the extant fragments of Aeolic poetry, are strictly analogous to the Aeolic *τῶδε*, &c., nor is it at all probable that the grammarians found *ἄλλοδης* and *ἄμοδης* and 'Aeolised' these forms. The Homeric *ἐπασσύντερος* (for

¹ Herr Dr. Karl Sittl und die Homerischen Aolismen, G. Hinrichs. Berlin, 1884.

ἐπασσύτερος) is compared by Sittl with τηλύγετος and αἰσωνμήτης, with the view of showing that the *v* may be original and not an Aeolic variation. But the latter word is probably of Aeolic origin and itself exemplifies the Aeolic *v* for *o*, since it is equivalent, according to Curtius, to αἰσωνμήτης from αἶσα and the root *μνα* ('one who minds the fights' of the competitors). As for τηλύγετος (which may likewise be an old Aeolic word), according to Savelsberg's highly probable explanation, it implies an adjective τηλῖς = 'large' (τηλύγετος, 'large-grown,' i.e. adult, cf. τηλέπυλος, 'large-gated'), but there is no such evidence of an adjective ἀσσῖς. The connection of ἐπασσωνγερός with μογερός has been questioned; but there is less room for dispute as to the connection of ἀμύμων with μῶμος. (See the last edition of Curtius' *Grundzüge*.) Sittl rejects the explanation of εἰκοσι, ἔεδνα, ἐέλδωρ, as having been originally formed with *v* replacing the initial digamma (ἑῖκοσι, ἕεδνα, ἑέλδωρ). He supposes that εἰκοσι (δφεῖκοσι) was written with *ε* prefixed ἐδφεῖκοσι, but he is obliged to assume that ἔεδνα, &c., are formed by erroneous analogy, the *ε* being prefixed although no initial consonant has dropped out. As regards the masculine nominatives in *δ* (e.g. ἱππότα), which Sittl (here supported by Meister) would account for as converted vocatives, Hinrichs adheres to the view that they are to be explained by the Aeolic accentuation and the omission of final *ς*, which occurs in some Boeotian inscriptions. Moreover, as Mr. Monro observes (*Homeric Grammar*, § 96), the other theory 'is not necessarily at variance with the Aeolic origin of the forms. If the usage began as a piece of ceremonial etiquette, it may well have been due to the influence of great Aeolic families.' Sittl objects to ζαῖν (*Od.* xi. 313), but there appears to be no valid reason against classing it, as Ahrens does, with the Aeolic accusatives δυσμένην, ἀβάκην, ἐμφέρην, &c. He would likewise correct ἀπειλήτην (*Od.* xi. 311) and one or two similar survivals of Aeolic verbs in *-μ*, but Curtius has shown (cf. Monro's *Homeric Grammar*, § 19) that these forms are exactly parallel to the Homeric φιλήμεναι, κινήμεναι, &c. He is willing to allow that the Homeric πῖσυνες may be directly related to the Lesbian πῆσσυνες, but he suggests that the Ionians borrowed the Aeolic form of the numeral through commercial intercourse. In regard to Aeolic *o* for *a* (before liquids), he demurs to the evidence of πόρδαλις (for πάρδαλις) for no better reason than that the word itself is not of Greek origin. But we have a clear

example in the old formula ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν, if ὄρχαμος is connected with ὄρχω, and the old epithet ἀργειφόντης, assuming the derivation from φαίνω, whether the word is interpreted 'swiftly appearing' or 'making the light (or lightning) to appear.' The difficult αἰζήλος (or αἰδηλος) may also be Aeolic. Hinrichs' interpretation 'ever visible' (Aeolic *ai* for *aei*, cf. αἰπάρθεος) gives the best sense in *Il.* ii. 318. The original form would appear to have been αἰδηλος, which was altered to distinguish it from αἰδηλος ('destructive'). The evidence of Aeolic *ε* for *a* before *ρ*, which is deducible from Θερσίτης and other proper names, is not to be set aside simply because similar names occasionally appear in later times outside the Aeolian area; though it is possible that θέρσος is an older form, rather than a dialectic variation, of θάρσος. (See Monro, in the *Journal of Philology*, vol. ix. p. 264.) Another Aeolic peculiarity (*φ* for *θ*) seems to have survived in the Homeric φῆρες for θῆρες (cf. Latin *fera*.) The fact that this form appears only as a personal name (of the Centaurs) may serve to explain the survival, but is no argument against the Aeolic origin of the word. The conversion of the digamma in ταλαῖρινος equally implies the Aeolic *v* for *a*, if the word is written ταλα-φρινος and derived directly from τ(α)λα = 'to bear' ('bearing a shield of ox-hide'). This substitution of *v* for *f* is undoubtedly characteristic of the Aeolic of Lesbos, and words of similar formation in Homer are numerous (e.g. καλαῖρψ, εὔληρα, ταναίπους, εὐκλος, besides those above mentioned). The Homeric text abounds in instances of the Aeolic prefix ζα, occurring, just as might be anticipated, in ancient epithets, and especially those of Aeolic towns. This evidence would remain equally applicable, even if it could be proved that ζά was not used by itself as the equivalent of διά in the Lesbian poetry, as Sittl contends. (He takes leave, however, to alter ζά to διά in Sappho fr. 87, ζά δ' ἐλεξάμαν ὄναρ Κυπρογενίη.) Nor is there any relevancy in the comparison between the Ionic variation λαγός for λαγός, and the forms ἔρος and γέλος (with dative ἔρω, γέλω, and accusative ἔρον, γέλον) which are common to the Homeric and the Aeolic dialect, and are quite distinct in their formation from the post-Homeric ἔρωρ- and γέλωρ-.

Fick's argument postulates these and other occasional Aeolisms in the Homeric dialect; but his special theory—that by far the greater portion both of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* was originally composed in the

Aeolic dialect—depends, in the main, on those elements which belong to the very ground-work of the Homeric language, such as the alternative forms of the personal pronouns instanced above. Those who deny the composite character of the dialect can only meet the argument, which these forms supply, by maintaining that they co-existed with the others in the Ionic dialect, either as part of the ordinary speech or as poetical varieties. Sittl attempts to diminish the difficulty of this assumption, in reference to the pronouns, by changing ἄμμες and ἱμμες into ἀμές or ἀμμές (= ἀσμές) and ἱμμές (= ἰσμές), from which, he suggests, ἡμέες and ἱμέες may have been derived through ἡμές and ἱμές. But the theory of an old-Ionian origin rests on a very uncertain basis of conjecture. And, while the evidence of the extant Aeolic poetry undoubtedly supports the theory of an Aeolian origin, as far as it goes, it will be shown that the evidence of the extant Ionic poetry tells the wrong way.

Fick includes in the Aeolic element other forms, which must be regarded as fundamental, e.g. the infinitive terminations -μεναι and -μεν, the genitive endings -αιο and -αιων, and the genitives formed by the suffix -θεν (ἐμεθεν, ῥέθεν, φέθεν), and the dative plural ending -εσσι, which occurs uniformly in Aeolic and never in Ionic texts (except a dubious fragment of Ananias, ἀλλὰ πᾶσιν ἰχθύεσσιν). This Aeolic element, he holds, can only be explained on the supposition that it represents the original text, on which the Ionic forms were engrafted by a simple process ('ganz roh und äusserlich') of translation. In order to test this theory, he has performed the reverse process—a retranslation into the Aeolic dialect—with results, which may be thus summed up: (1) The intermixture of Aeolic and Ionic forms is determined by the metre. The Ionic forms are adhered to, as a rule, where the metre allows; while the Aeolic forms are retained chiefly as a matter of metrical necessity or convenience. (2) Certain portions of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* present obstacles to retranslation, such as imply that the author or authors of these sections composed them in the Ionic dialect, only copying the traditional 'Epic' phrases. These additions consist, for the *Iliad*, chiefly of passages inserted as connecting links to unite various episodes with the body of the poem, the episodes themselves having been composed at a somewhat earlier date by poets, perhaps of Ionian extraction, but well versed in the Aeolic dialect. The episodes in question are

the Catalogue of the Ships (which was probably imported from the Cypria with some alteration), the meeting of Glaucus and Diomedes (*Il.* vi. 119–236), the Embassy (bk. ix.), the Doloneia, the Shield of Achilles, and the Funeral Games. But the speech of Phoenix in the Embassy, and the Μάχη παραποτάμιος (bk. xv.) likewise betray an Ionic hand, being 'stark mit festen ionismen versetzt.' For the *Odyssey*, the portions which Fick would assign on linguistic evidence to Ionian authorship, prove to be exactly identical with those which Kirchhoff, arguing from the subject-matter alone, had already assigned to an editor, who expanded the four component poems into nearly their present shape.

Fick has made the further conjecture that the Ionic reviser, who completed the two poems, was the Cynaethus, whose memory is preserved in the account quoted from Hippostratus by the scholiast on Pindar, *Nem.* ii. 1. 'The name of Homeridae was originally given to the descendants of Homer, who continued the recitation of his poetry. This was done subsequently by rhapsodists not connected with Homer by descent; among these were conspicuous Cynaethus and his school, who are said to have composed many of the verses and inserted them in the poetry of Homer. This Cynaethus was a native of Chios. He is said to have composed the hymn to Apollo, the hymn thus entitled being one of the poems inscribed as Homer's. This Cynaethus first rhapsodised the Epic poetry of Homer at Syracuse in the 69th Olympiad, according to Hippostratus.' The testimony of this writer is valuable on the point in question, as his special subject was Sicily. The other extracts collected by Carl Müller show that he compiled quasi-historical records in the form of genealogies, embodying the local traditions. One fragment, for example, relates to the Cottytia, a festival celebrated in Sicily and at Corinth. The statement that this rhapsodist was also the composer of the hymn to (the Delian) Apollo is supported not only by Pliny (*H.N.* iv. 12, 22) but by the internal evidence of the alternative conclusion (v. 14–18) adapted to a Syracusan audience. That he was the reviser of the *Odyssey* is rendered very probable by the interpolated reference to Ortygia (*Od.* v. 121–4), the forced allusion to the palm-tree by the altar of Apollo in Delos (vi. 161–7. Cf. the hymn, v. 18 and v. 117), and the marked references to Sicily and South Italy (i. 184, xx. 383, xxiv. 211, 338, 365 ff.). The completion of the *Iliad*

is ascribed to this poet partly on the evidence of an interpolation in the Catalogue (*Il.* ii. 594-600), describing the blindness of Thamyris, the Thracian minstrel, whom the Homerids would claim as a predecessor, if not as an ancestor. The author of the hymn makes particular mention of his blindness at the same time that he sings his own praise:—'Fare ye well, ladies all, and bethink ye of me hereafter, when any of earthly kind coming hither, a stranger worn with travel, enquireth of you: "Damsels, what man among the minstrels who resort hither is most welcome unto you, and in whom do ye chiefly delight?" Then give ye a kindly answer, one and all: "Tis a blind man, and he dwelleth in rugged Chios. His song will

be prized even in aftertime." And I will spread your renown upon the earth, as far as I roam among the fair-lying cities of men.' The whole tenour of this speech, as well as the mention of the poet's migration, is certainly appropriate to the rhapsodist, who had made his name famous by his additions to 'Homer.' The object for which, according to Fick, these additions were made, was the competitive recitation by rhapsodists at the Delian festival, introduced, perhaps, about the time when the Ionian revolt was preparing and the Ionians were drawn together by an impulse of patriotism. (Cf. Professor Sayce in the *Academy*, Nov. 15, 1884).

G. C. WARR.

(To be continued.)

EARLY CLASSICAL MSS. IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

THE starting of a Classical Review in England affords an opportunity for attempting a piece of work, which, if rightly carried out, will be of no small advantage to scholars who may be engaged upon the texts of Greek and Latin authors, and, it may be hoped, also of interest to students in general. This work is the compilation of a brief catalogue of all existing MSS. of Greek and Latin classical literature in the libraries of the United Kingdom. Such a scheme can only be successfully accomplished by cooperation; but it may be anticipated that there will be no lack of assistance in the universities and large central libraries where the greater number of MSS. are accumulated. It may be objected that the catalogues of the several libraries should suffice; but, as every librarian knows, older catalogues are far from accurate, particularly in the matter of assigning dates, and in most large libraries the catalogues are inconveniently numerous, requiring in some instances rather severe study for the digestion of their contents. Moreover, in some libraries the catalogues are still unprinted. To lead the way, then, in this proposal, I hope to contribute from time to time to the pages of the *Classical Review* concise descriptions of the MSS. of early Greek and Latin writers in the British Museum. As an introduction to the work, the present article may be devoted to a notice of the classical papyri, which, from their great antiquity, occupy a preeminent position of their own.

Of the very few surviving classical Greek works written on papyrus, the most important have, one by one, found their way into the British Museum. This is matter for consolation; for the national collections are by no means strong in ancient copies of the Greek and Latin classics. In these days one cannot hope to make up much lost ground in this respect. The most precious vellum texts are already safely housed in public libraries. But papyri may still be unearthed from the tombs of Egypt. The great collection of documents now at Vienna and Berlin, among which many rare fragments have already been brought to light, and which are being subjected to the close labour of competent scholars, will probably yield important results. And when we bear in mind that the papyri, which it is proposed to form the subject of the present paper, have all been purchased within the last thirty years, we need not altogether despair of the future.

The Greek classical papyri of the British Museum are five in number. Two contain portions of two of the books of the *Iliad*: three, the orations of Hyperides. They have all been described at some length in the *Catalogue of Ancient Manuscripts in the British Museum* (part 1, Greek, London, 1881); I will briefly sketch their history and palaeographical value.

1. The Harris Homer (Papyrus cvii.). This papyrus is in two fragments which were obtained by Mr. A. C. Harris of Alexandria on two different occasions, in 1849

and 1850, from a tomb, known as the Crocodile Pit, at Ma'abdey near Monfalat, the second fragment being the first that was found. Both fragments were purchased for the Museum in 1872. They contain portions of book xviii. of the *Iliad*, viz. (1) lines 1—171 and, in a broken column, the first words of ll. 172—218, and (2) ll. 311—617. The papyrus is much discoloured, so much so indeed that the text requires a good light for the rather painful process of reading. For this reason it has been printed in full in the Catalogue. The writing is in slender uncials, generally upright, sometimes almost sloping back to the left. The regularity of the hand and its natural freedom, without trace of the artificiality which can generally be detected in imitative writing, has led me to venture to assign this papyrus to the first century B.C. But our palaeographical knowledge of these remote times is still but scanty. The documents are rare, and until more are brought to light, and until sufficient facsimiles are printed and collected together, we cannot hope to attain to that exact education of the eye which familiarity with the objects alone can give. I may notice in this place that a remarkably bad facsimile of a few lines from this Homer which was printed in Gerhard's *Archäolog. Zeitung*, 1849, gave birth to the myth that the rough breathing appears in the line of writing in the shape of an open *a*, which has been quoted as a noteworthy fact in the handbooks on Greek Palaeography.

2. The Bankes Homer (Papyrus cxiv.). This papyrus is in one piece, measuring upwards of seven feet, and containing sixteen columns of writing. It was bought by Mr. W. J. Bankes at Elephantine, in 1821, and passed into possession of the British Museum in 1879. The text is book xxiv. of the *Iliad*, wanting the first 126 lines; well known by the collation published by George Cornewall Lewis in the *Cambridge Philological Museum*, in 1832. This is one of the few surviving MSS. which contain stichometrical notes, every hundred lines being numbered in the margin. From its first discovery the Bankes Homer has taken high rank as a most ancient MS., and has been quoted with veneration in palaeographical and other works. In the Museum Catalogue, however, it is assigned to the second century of our era. This later date will probably prove in the end to be much nearer the mark than the more remote century before Christ in which it has been placed. The writing is in round uncials and much more nearly resembles the book-hand

of the early Biblical Codices of the fourth and fifth centuries than the writing of the Ptolemaic period.

The papyri containing the orations of Hyperides are, as already stated, three in number, that is, they form three numbers in the Museum Catalogue. Two of them, however, originally formed part of the same roll and must be taken together. The evil practice of the Arabs, who break up papyri which they discover in order to make, as they think, better bargains by disposing of them piecemeal, is answerable for their mutilated condition. All the extant works of the Athenian orator are included in the Museum fragments.

3 and 4. The oration of Hyperides for Lycophron (Papyrus cxv.) and the oration against Demosthenes respecting the Treasure of Harpalus (Papyrus cxviii.). The first is a very fine specimen, more than eleven feet in length, and contains forty-nine columns of writing. Mr. Joseph Arden purchased it, in 1847, at Gournou, in the district of Western Thebes. It was bought for the Museum in 1879; by a strange coincidence on the same day on which the Bankes Homer was also acquired. The second is in thirty-three fragments, which came into possession of Mr. Harris in 1847, and passed to the Museum in 1872. The texts of both orations are known by the facsimile editions of Prof. Churchill Babington and Mr. Harris. As to the date of the writing of this fine MS. there are various opinions. It is in very beautifully-formed uncials of, apparently, an unusual type. It has been assigned to as early a period as the second century B.C. The Museum Catalogue makes it a century younger. Dr. Blass goes further: he would place it as low as the period of Hadrian and the Antonines. We must be content for the present to leave the question open and await more light.

5. The Funeral Oration of Hyperides in honour of Leosthenes, the Athenian general, and his comrades who fell in the Lamian war, B.C. 323 (Papyrus cxviii.). This papyrus, in fragments, was purchased in 1857 from Rev. H. Stobart, who procured it in the previous year from the neighbourhood of Thebes. It is well known by the edition of Prof. Churchill Babington. Palaeographically, it has a special interest. On the reverse side is written, among other matter, a horoscope, cast for a person born at the end of the first, or in the middle of the second, century. It was naturally inferred that this was an addition written after the oration had been inscribed on the other side. The

case is, however, exactly the reverse. Dr. Blass, from a close scrutiny of the joints in the papyrus and for other reasons, has conclusively shown that the horoscope is in fact on the *face* of the roll, and the oration on the *back*; and his suggestion that the latter is merely a student's exercise is supported by the existence of many clerical faults and by the character of the writing, which is in the roughly-formed uncial letters of apparently an unpractised hand. These facts bring down the date of the MS. to the second century of the Christian era.

Before concluding, it may be of interest to draw attention to a MS. in the Museum which bears internal and pretty conclusive evidence of having been copied from a prototype written on papyrus. This evidence consists in the gaps left blank in the text by the very conscientious or very ignorant scribe. The MS. in question is the Harley MS. 5792 (*Cat. Anc. MSS.* p. 10), containing a Greek and Latin glossary copied in the seventh century. The words in the two languages being written in parallel columns, it is evident that the scribe has followed exactly the arrangement of the prototype, which must have been, in places, in a very imperfect condition. From the exact way in which the scribe has copied only what he saw, arranging his letters on the plan of the text before him, we can trace the actual shapes of the lacunae; and these shapes lead us to the conclusion that the lacunae were caused by actual rents or holes rather than by abrasions, and that the material was papyrus and not vellum. The strongest piece of evidence occurs in that part of the

glossary which contains words beginning with $\pi\epsilon\phi$. Here there occurs a lacuna in which several successive words in the Greek have entirely disappeared with the exception of those three initial letters, or at most four letters, while the beginnings of the Latin equivalents are also mutilated. In this instance there has evidently been a large hole in the prototype, having on one side an almost even edge cutting the Greek words vertically. Papyrus, as we know, is a material which splits up just in the way indicated by the even edge of the lacuna; whereas a hole in vellum or a defacement upon it would scarcely follow such a straight line. Although not bearing directly upon the present argument, it is interesting to know that such glossaries were actually written on papyrus, although the example on record is not earlier than the sixth century, whereas the prototype of the Harley MS. was probably, from its mutilated condition, of a much older date. In the *Comment. Soc. Göttingen*, iv. (1820), p. 156, and *Rhein. Museum*, v. (1837), p. 301, the fragments of such a glossary are described. In conclusion it may be noted that exact line-for-line or page-for-page reproduction in the middle ages of ancient prototypes was, we know, practised not only in cases where, as in the Harley glossary, the nature of the text required it, but also where illustrative drawings accompanied the text and where it was therefore necessary to maintain the proper arrangement between text and drawing. Some examples of this will have to be considered hereafter.

E. MAUNDE THOMPSON.

THE REFORMED PRONUNCIATION OF LATIN.

FOR years the prevailing pronunciation of Latin in England has been condemned by all competent judges; and still it has been thought a hopeless task to supplant it. But within the last few months the prospect has suddenly brightened; and the hope that some day the ancient Latin tongue would receive its rights has grown into an expectation that this some day will be soon. The Cambridge Philological Society, stimulated by the efforts of teachers who felt that the old pronunciation and, still more, the jargon of old and new together, was an intolerable burden and anomaly, issued to its members

a scheme of pronunciation prepared for that purpose which, after running the gauntlet of searching criticism, has been published, with certain modifications, in a pamphlet published by Messrs Trübner, and entitled *The Pronunciation of Latin in the Augustan Period*. The scheme was most favourably received by members of the Society, both resident and non-resident; how favourably, may be judged from the fact that out of twenty-seven lecturers in Cambridge, twenty-five were in favour of a reform in the direction proposed, while out of thirteen headmasters, professors, assistant-masters, not

resident in Cambridge, only one was opposed to all reform, the remainder, including six head-masters, either already using the new pronunciation or being willing to adopt it if adopted in the Universities. With the final consideration and adoption of the scheme arose the question of its introduction into practical teaching. This question was obviously twofold: part relating to Cambridge, and part to the outer world. The reformed pronunciation, it was clear, could be introduced into Cambridge without much difficulty. A committee was accordingly appointed, and subsequently enlarged, so as to be representative of the whole University, for that purpose. They have communicated with all the classical professors and lecturers of the University asking them to use the pronunciation of Latin recommended in the scheme in their teaching, and to report any difficulties that they find in using it to the committee. Without being too sanguine, we may say that the reformed pronunciation of Latin will be generally, if not universally, adopted throughout Cambridge in the Michaelmas term. The other question was one of considerably greater difficulty, and importance. Cambridge, although ready and willing to set her own house in order, and undesirous of seeing a genuine movement in favour of reform pass again into inertia, could not take upon herself singlehanded the introduction of the new pronunciation throughout the country. Proposals for cooperation were made to Oxford, and responded to in a like spirit. The Oxford Philological Society, having considered *The Pronunciation of Latin in the Augustan Period*, have passed two resolutions, one expressing their general agreement with the views proposed, and another their opinion that it is generally desirable that the scheme should be adopted in practice, and singling out certain points as specially important. The agreement of the two Societies, which will no doubt have further practical issues, is the greatest step which has hitherto been gained. But that there are difficulties still in the way, some real and some imaginary, cannot be gainsaid; and with these, so far as they concern the 'scheme' itself, we now propose to deal. It is frequently, if silently, assumed, that Latin pronunciation is not sufficiently ascertained to admit of the promulgation of a scheme. This view is based upon an error. Undoubtedly there are disputed points within its range. But they are comparatively few and unimportant; and no body of scholars, however chosen, who understood the question, could draw up a scheme which would differ

in general effect and essential particulars from the present one. Another fallacy hardly less mischievous is the assumption that we should begin with the whole of the changes at once. No such change can be made all at once. With the best intentions it is impossible to change the whole of our pronunciation suddenly. But the ideal should be always kept in view, and fresh advances continually made. To come to details, we see that a very large proportion of the difficulty of the reformed pronunciation arises not from the fact that we do not possess the equivalent sounds in English; but from the fact that the Latin letter has usually a different value in English. This is the case with *ä, a, î, ù, ü, c, s* final, *th, ph* (see below), *i* consonant (*j*), *u* consonant (*v*). To take one or two examples, it is just as easy to us to pronounce *res* as *rass* as to pronounce it *reeze*, to pronounce *uas* as *wake* as to pronounce it *vass*; but the analogy of English spelling suggests the other pronunciation. The whole difficulty arises from not treating Latin as French or German, that is as a foreign language in which the native pronunciation of the letters is to be discarded. If Latin were a spoken language, no one would think of pronouncing *nānus* *nainus*, any more than of pronouncing *āne* *ain*. Next come the sounds which can be easily learnt from French, several of the vowels, the rolled *r* (also in Scotch), the dentals *t, d, n, l, s*. That the tongue did touch the teeth in the Latin sounds is certain; and there is no difficulty in making it do so. But as the acoustic difference between the English and Latin sounds is not great, it is not a point that need be insisted on at first. The vowels of *maximus* (*maxumus*) and *zythum* are found in French and German. But that they should be given in Latin at present is perhaps too much to expect. The aspirates *ch, th, ph*, if it be found too difficult to pronounce them as *k, t, p*, followed by *h*, should at least be given by *k, t, p*. The point of the scheme which involves most doubt and difficulty is that of final *-m*, and its discussion has been properly placed in a footnote. It is perhaps beyond hope that a pitch accent will be heard on English lips, but the hammering English accent might be so far mitigated as to allow the post-accentual syllables to have their proper length. The desirability of giving the quantities is admitted on all hands; but to do so properly requires some patience and practice. To sum up: all that really can be matter of doubt is the exact pronunciation of certain vowels (*ē, ō, î, y*), the precise value of *u* con-

sonant which is in any case very nearly rendered by English *w*, perhaps also that of the diphthongs *ae*, *oe*, and final *m*. In all other cases the correct representative is either actually an English sound, and this in the

great majority of the sounds, or one which is actually taught in our schools to the classes that are learning French.

J. P. POSTGATE.

ON SOME POLITICAL TERMS EMPLOYED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

(Concluded from page 8.)

Δῆμος, λαός.

There are other political terms which are conspicuous by their absence from the New Testament. Δῆμος occurs only four times in the New Testament. The LXX. never use it except for a subdivision of the people, after the analogy of the Attic 'demes.' Δημηγορεῖν in the New Testament means to address a multitude, but not in a constitutional assembly; thus Acts xii. 21: ὁ Ἡρώδης . . . ἐδημηγόρει πρὸς αὐτοὺς. Δῆμος occurs in the same passage (Acts xii. 22): ὁ δὲ δῆμος ἐπεφώνει, Θεοῦ φωνή, κ.τ.λ. Also in Acts xvii. 5: καὶ ἐπιστάντες τῇ οἰκίᾳ Ἰάσονος ἐζήτουν αὐτοὺς προαγαγεῖν εἰς τὸν δῆμον, —in both texts it means multitude, or rabble. It is twice used in the narrative of the Ephesian riot (Acts xix. 30, 33): Παῦλον δὲ βουλομένον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸν δῆμον, ὁ δὲ Ἀλέξανδρος . . . ᾗθελεν ἀπολογεῖσθαι τῷ δῆμῳ. We are however expressly told that this was a tumult (στάσις, συστροφή and not an ἐννομος ἐκκλησία, vv. 40, 39), and it only receives the name of ἐκκλησία at its orderly and formal dismissal: καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν (sc. ὁ γραμματεὺς) ἀπέλυσεν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν (v. 41). We cannot be mistaken in supposing that one reason why the Jews avoided the word δῆμος as a name of the 'people of God' was because the term had been discredited by the decline of Greek freedom, and the idea of democracy could not survive in a political atmosphere wherein despotism prevailed. Moreover δῆμος was a term at once too technical, and too strictly civic to designate the members not so much of a city as of a nation. The word λαός was just the word required. It had very noble associations in the past history of Greek life. It was a great word with Homer. Though rarely found in old Attic prose, it is a favourite with the poets. It was familiar to Attic ears in the herald's formula Ἀκούετε λέω, and was perpetuated in social life through names like Λαοδίκη, Ἀγγοδίαος, which will always be found to carry a certain dignity with them. It was used by Plato and again by

Polybius; but it was reserved for Jewish lips to give the word a sacred significance and a world-wide currency.

ἔθνος.

ἔθνος, the correlative of λαός in the mouth of Hellenistic Jews, was a word that never had any importance as a political term until after Alexander. It was when Hellenism pushed on eastward, and the policy of Alexander and his successors founded cities as outposts of trade and civilisation, that the contrast was felt and expressed between πόλεις and ἔθνη. Hellenic life found its normal type in the πόλις, and barbarians who lived κατὰ κάμας or in some less organised form were ἔθνη. Droysen has illustrated this in his *Hellenismus* (iii. 1, p. 31-32). He cites e.g. Arrian, *Indica*, 40: Σουσίους δὲ πρόσκοικοι ὅτι εἰσὶν οἱ Οὐξιοί, λέλεκται μὲν κατὰπερ Μάρδοι μὲν Πέρσησι προσεχές οἰκούνσι, λησται καὶ οὗτοι, Κοσσαῖοι δὲ Μήδοισι. καὶ ταῦτα πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἡμέρῳσεν Ἀλέξανδρος . . . καὶ πόλιν ἐπέκτισε τοῦ μὴ νομάδας ἐπὶ εἶναι, ἀλλὰ ἀρτυήρας καὶ γῆς ἐργάτας, κ.τ.λ. So in the great Smyrna inscription (at Oxford, *C.I.G.* 3137, line 11): ἔγραψεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς βασιλεῖς καὶ τοὺς δυνάστας καὶ τὰς πόλεις καὶ τὰ ἔθνη. So Teles apud Stob. vol. ii. p. 66 (Teubner text) ἐνιοὶ δέ γε καὶ φρουροῦσι τὰς πόλεις παρὰ βασιλεῦσι καὶ ἔθνη πιστεύονται κ.τ.λ. (are employed by kings to garrison the cities or are put in charge of peoples). In Polybius vii. 9, πόλεις καὶ ἔθνη are contrasted repeatedly, and we have also βασιλείων καὶ πόλεων καὶ ἐθνέων. At the same time because ἔθνος was thus opposed to πόλις it was used not seldom for 'a district united by a federal league.' So Polybius xxvii. 2: τὸ δὲ Βουσιῶν ἔθνος ἐπὶ πολὺν χρόνον συντετηρηκὸς τὴν κοινὴν συμπολιτείαν . . . κατελύθη καὶ διεσκορπίσθη κατὰ πόλεις. At a later date I find ἔθνος used for the inhabitants of a Roman province (ἐπαρχεία): instances may be found in the passages cited by Marquardt, *Röm. Alt.* iv. p. 374 note, and in Wood's *Inscriptions from the*

Odeum (Ephesus), No. 1. These various uses of *ἔθνος* in the Gentile world are exactly reproduced in its employment by the LXX. and the New Testament. Usually it describes the pagan world, outside the Jewish Church. Yet it does occasionally stand for the *λαός* itself: τοῦ ἔθνους τοῦ Ἰουδαίων (Acts x. 22). In Acts xxiv. 3, 10 the shade of meaning is ambiguous, and may refer less to the nationality of the Jews than to their grouping into a Roman province; but verse 17 is decisive: ἐλεημοσύνας ποιήσω εἰς τὸ ἔθνος μου. So also in Acts xxvi. 4, xxviii. 19, and elsewhere in St. Luke and St. John.

Ἐκκλησία.

Next we must notice the names of public assemblies in the New Testament,—ἐκκλησία, συναγωγή, βουλευτής, γερουσία, συνέδριον.

Concerning the all-important word ἐκκλησία I merely observe in passing that we must banish from our minds all remembrance of its etymology from ἐκ-καλέσαι (however correct in itself), inasmuch as the ἐκκλησία always and everywhere in Greece was the reverse of an exclusive assembly. Indeed it was the most inclusive word in existence for a constitutional assembly, embracing all free citizens of full age, excluding only aliens, females and αἰτιμοί. This is worth remembering in view of comments like that of St. Augustine (*In Ep. Rom. Inch. Expos.* T. iii. Pt. ii. p. 925): 'Ecclesia ex vocatione appellata,'—a form of comment which I have met with occasionally in modern Calvinist manuals (comp. Pearson *On the Creed*, Art. ix. ch. 1, § 3 note, where his good sense and good scholarship do not fail him). The Christian ἐκκλησία, if it is to be true to the political origin of its name, must include all those who are enfranchised by Baptism unless they be excommunicate.

Συναγωγή.

Συναγωγή in the LXX. is nearly synonymous with ἐκκλησία, see the phrase Lev. viii. 3: πᾶσαν τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐκκλησίαςον ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου: so Numb. xx. 8; Josh. xviii. 1, etc. In old Attic συναγωγή was used of the convening of a board: συναγωγῆς δὲ τῶν λογιστῶν ἡ βουλὴ αὐτοκράτωρ ἔστω (*Manual*, No. 37): similarly ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ συννόμῳ συναγωγῇ τῶν συνέδρων, i.e. of the senate of Andania (Andania decree, Dittenberger, *Syll.* No. 388, line 49: 1st cent. B.C.). In the 'Will of Epikteta' (2nd or 3rd cent. B.C. *C.I.G.* 2448) συναγωγή denotes the 'assembling' of the *θίασος* or corporation founded by the bequest. In *C.I.G.* 3069 συναγωγή denotes a *θίασος* of Attalists (Ἱεος)

of the 2nd cent. B.C. The word therefore before its adoption by the Jews, had formerly a perfectly neutral sense of 'convening' an assembly, with a tendency as time went on to become appropriated to the assembling of a sacred brotherhood. Once only in the New Testament is συναγωγή used (if then) of a Christian assembly, in James ii. 2, and then it refers to Jewish Christians. Ἐπισυναγωγή occurs twice in the New Testament, in Heb. x. 25 of the assembling of the Church on earth, in 2 Thess. ii. 1 of the reunion of the Church in glory.

Βουλῇ.

The word βουλῇ has a very slight hold upon the LXX.; they never use it in a technical sense: e.g. Ps. i. 5: ἐν βουλῇ δικαίων: 1 Macc. xiv. 22, in what purports to be a letter from Sparta, τὰ εἰρημένα ἐν ταῖς βουλαῖς τοῦ δήμου (!). The title βουλευτής occurs twice in a colourless sense in Job iii. 14; xii. 17: and Dr. Field (on Acts ii. 24) notices that the translator of Job aimed at an artificial classicalism. In the New Testament βουλῇ signifies counsel, never council. In St. Mark xv. 43 Joseph of Arimathea is styled εὐσχήμων βουλευτής: St. Luke (xxiii. 50) says of him βουλευτής ὑπάρχων. In both passages the word appears to denote membership of the Sanhedrin; but both SS. Mark and Luke are writing for Gentile readers. Otherwise βουλῇ and βουλευτής were not technical terms among the Jews for their Sanhedrin, although we find in Josephus, *Bell. J.* ii. 17 § 1: οἱ τε ἄρχοντες καὶ οἱ βουλευταί: and *Ant.* xx. 1 § 2, in an edict of Claudius: Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν ἄρχουσι βουλῇ δήμῳ Ἰουδαίων παντὶ ἔθνει.

Γερουσία, πρεσβύτεροι, συνέδριον.

Why then this omission of βουλῇ and βουλευτής, terms which designate the most important feature in Greek civic life? And why in their place do we find γερουσία, συνέδριον, πρεσβύτεροι?

Fully to answer this question would take us too far away from our present object into the details of Greek political antiquities. It is enough to say that the βουλῇ, organised after the Attic model, was the key-stone of old Greek democracy. And as such, it was naturally no favourite with the despots who succeeded Alexander. Antigonos and Demetrius were the last potentates who affected to be partial to democracy. From their downfall at Ipsus B.C. 301, we may date the destruction of free government in Greek cities. At Ephesus we know from

Strabo, as compared with the extant inscriptions, exactly what took place. Lysimachus allowed the forms of democracy to go on as before; but he established a new board, a *γερονσία*, and its influence was practically dominant. We know nothing of the numbers of this board, nor of their mode of appointment. We do not certainly know what were their legal functions. Those who desire to read the best published discussion of this matter should consult the essay of Menadier already quoted (*Qua condicione Ephesii*, etc. p. 48 foll.). In part iii. of the Greek inscriptions in the British Museum, now in the press, I have had to go over the ground afresh, and restate the question. My results are these:—

(1) The *βουλή* all over Greece declined in importance, and became a mere honorary corporation in the times of the Diadochi and of the Roman senatorial government.

(2) The case of Ephesus is by no means solitary. Not only at Ephesus, but in cities all over Greece, we hear of a *γερονσία* in Roman imperial times; and the presumption is, that what Lysimachus founded in the cities of his dominion, the Romans deliberately encouraged everywhere.

(3) The functions of the Gerousia were probably, in the first instance, religious and ecclesiastical. Thus at Ephesus, I believe the Gerousia to have taken in charge the revenues and general administration of the Artemision only; although from this vantage ground its influence and power was felt in all matters of civil administration.

(4) At Ephesus and elsewhere it is abundantly certain that *οἱ πρεσβύτεροι* and *τὸ συνέδριον* were convertible terms with *γερονσία*. Assuming these statements to be true (and I think they can be proved beyond dispute), we have at once a complete account of the origin of the word Sanhedrin for the sacred council of the Jews. We also understand why *γερονσία* (Acts v. 21), and not *βουλή*, was its recognised Greek name; while *οἱ πρεσβύτεροι* are simply the members of the *γερονσία*. All these terms, so familiar to us first in their Jewish, and afterwards in their Christian usage, had been commonly employed before, in a precisely analogous sense, in Graeco-Roman civic life.

Ἀρχων.

I need say nothing on the word *ἄρχων* after the excellent remarks of Schürer (p. 18 foll.). He shows from Jewish inscriptions what the use of the word in Greek politics would suggest, that with the Jews *οἱ ἄρχοντες* were the official members, the executive of the *γερονσία*.

In the New Testament the word is of frequent occurrence.

Πρεσβείω.

Some other New Testament words have interesting political associations. Thus the office of ambassador (*πρεσβεία*, Luke xiv. 32; xix. 14; *πρεσβείω*, 2 Cor. v. 20; Eph. vi. 20), was in everyday use in the intercourse between the Greek cities, and between them and the kings.

Ἰδιότης.

The word *ιδιότης*, though of common use in classical Greek for a 'layman' in contrast with the professors of any kind of art, yet perhaps in the New Testament hardly lost the memory of its political origin.

Acts iv. 13, *ἀγρόματοι εἰσι καὶ ἰδιῶται* i.e. not of the official class.

1 Cor. xiv. 16: *τὸν τύπον τοῦ ἰδιώτου.* } i.e.

„ 23, 24: *ἄπιστος ἢ ἰδιώτης.* } i.e. a member of the Christian *ἐκκλησία*, but an ignorant one.

2 Cor. xi. 6: *ιδιότης τῷ λόγῳ* = 'no speaker.'

Κήρυξ.

It was reserved for the Gospel to give strange dignity and world-wide importance to the *κήρυξ* (*κηρύσσω*, *κήρυγμα*) a well-known subordinate figure in every Greek assembly, in public games, or other formal gathering.

*Ἐκδικος, ἐκδικεῖν.

It has occurred to me whether the favourite LXX. and New Testament terms *ἐκδικος*, *ἐκδικέω*, *ἐκδικήσεις* (in the post-classical sense of 'avenger' &c.) may not be derived from the official *Ἐκδικος* (compare *σύνδικος*), a special advocate (champion) of a city (Cic. *ad Fam.* xiii. 56). The word is not uncommon in the Graeco-Roman inscriptions; and the office of the *ἐκδικος* was important and frequently called into use by the Greek cities under Roman rule.

Δόγμα.

Δόγμα was not the regular word in republican Greece for a decree of the *boule* and *demos*: the technical term was *ψήφισμα*, and *δόγμα* (or rather *τὰ δόξαντα*, *τὰ δεδογμένα*) an occasional synonym. The following passage of Thucydides illustrates what I mean (iii. 49; when the Athenians countermand their cruel decree respecting Mytilenē): *ἡ μὲν ἐφθασε τοσοῦτον ὅσον Πάχητα ἀνεγνωκέναι τὸ ψήφισμα καὶ μέλλειν δράσειν τὰ δεδογμένα* κ.τ.λ. The instances of *δόγμα* quoted from the orators by L. and S. s.v. prove no more than this. In later Greek we find *δόγματι* sometimes for the decrees of the Areopagus, *C.I.A.*

iii. 687, 704, 720b, 836b, 687a. Occasionally it occurs elsewhere, as in Crete, *C.I.G.* 2593—2597; 3049 from Sibyrtos in Crete; 1193 from Asine and Hermione in Argolis. But the special use of the word *δόγμα* was for a decree of the Roman Senate (*Senatus Consultum, decreto Senatus*):—

C.I.G. 2486. Astypalaea, B.C. 105.

„ 2737a.

„ 3197. Smyrna, temp. Hadrian.

„ 2905. Priene, B.C. 135.

Mommsen's *Marmor Ancyranum*, iv. 17, temp. Augusti.

Hicks, *Manual*, 200, Miletus, B.C. 135.

C.I.A. ii. 424, Attica, 2nd cent. B.C.

Δογματίζειν is also found:—

τὰ *δογματισθέντα* of *Senatus consulta*, Astypalaea, B.C. 105, *C.I.* 2485.

δογματίζω to decree (honours), of a Greek decree of Cyme, temp. Augusti, *C.I.G.* 3524.

δογματίζω in a decree of a *θίασος* (Naples, late) *C.I.G.* 5785.

Side by side with this political use of *δόγμα*, *δογματίζω* was their philosophical use for the *placita philosophorum*, which needs no illustration from me.

The words are used literally by St. Luke, ii. 1, Acts xvii. 7, of the decrees of the Emperor; and in Acts xvi. 4, of the decrees of the Council at Jerusalem. St. Paul used the words in a figurative sense, Eph. ii. 15; Col. ii. 14. And he invents a new and startling meaning for *δογματίζω*, *δογματίζεσθε*—‘decree-ridden,’ Col. ii. 20. The general idea conveyed by the word was a positive ordinance, emanating from a distant and unquestionable authority.

Let me add a word or two concerning the document issued by the Council at Jerusalem. It is interesting to note how it conforms in various particulars to the usual type of Greek public documents. It is a letter, introducing to the notice of the readers a formal decree; though the decree is not appended to the letter as was usually the case (cp. e.g. No. 200 of my *Manual*), but is worked into the latter portion of the Epistle itself. I observe the following points of resemblance to regular Greek documents:—

1. The salutation *χαίρειν* etc., only found besides in the New Testament in St. Luke's preface, in Lysias's letter, and the opening of St. James's Epistle.

2. The closing farewell: *ἔρρωθε* (in Acts xxiii. 30 omitted).

3. The preamble commencing with *Ἐπειδή*.

4. The formal word *ἔδοξε*, *βίε*, vv. 25, 28.

5. The sending of envoys to deliver the

decree, and to say the same by word of mouth.

I may remark on two points of interpretation in this document.

1. *γενομένοις ὁμοθυμαδόν* is only a strong expression for ‘assembled all together’ (so Acts v. 12; xii. 20). The decree is not the manifesto of a cabal or a faction, but a decree of the entire Church convened together.

2. That τὰ αὐτά must mean ‘the same as the contents of the decree following’ is made absolutely certain by a comparison of a common formula in Greek decrees: let me cite an example from a recently published decree of Priene in acknowledgment of a decree brought by an envoy from Alexandria Troas: ἐπελθὼν δὲ καὶ Νικασαγόρας ἐπὶ τε τὴν βουλὴν καὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἀκούσθους διελέγει τοῖς ἐν τῷ ψηφίσματι κατακεχωρισμένοις. Or this from a letter of Lysimachus to Priene: [οἱ παρ' ὑμῶν πρὸς ἡμᾶς πρ]εσβεύται Ἀντισθένης [καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ . . . τ]ὸ τε ψήφισμα [ἀπεδόσαν] ἡμῖν κ[αὶ αὐτ]οὶ . . . διελέγησαν παραπλησίως τοῖς ἐν τῷ [ψηφί]σματι γεγραμμένοις, ἐμφανίζοντες κ.τ.λ.¹ Instances of this kind I might multiply to any extent.

Διαλέγεσθαι.

Let me add that there is a large group of words employed in the New Testament which though not confined in secular Greek to the language of politics, yet were so frequently and systematically employed in public documents, that probably their precise shade of meaning can better be determined from inscriptions than from any other source.

Such a word is *διαλέγεσθαι*, *διαλεγῆναι*, *διαλεχθῆναι*, which occurs in the last two quotations. In these instances, and many more of the same type, *διαλέγομαι* has not the sense of arguing or of conversing, but means primarily to address an assembly, or a king. In the New Testament, with the exception of St. Mark ix. 34, it always is used of addressing, preaching, lecturing, and these instances are all from the Acts.

ὑποθεσία, ὑποθεσία.

I may note that in Greece, before the Roman Conquest, the custom of adoption had become frequent. In public documents, phrases like the following are of common occurrence (I quote from a Rhodian decree of the 2nd century B.C.): Εὐφάνιος καλιξείων καθ' ὑπο[ε]σίαν δὲ Νικασιδάμου.² When St. Paul employs the word *ὑποθεσία* in his

¹ *Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum*, part iii. section 1, Nos. 419, 402.

² *Ibid.* No. 403, line 2.

Epistles, we need not suppose that he borrowed the idea, any more than he took the word, from Roman usage.

Μαρτυρεῖσθαι.

I have observed in later Greek documents the use of *μαρτυρεῖσθαι* *μαρτυρία* for 'the good name' witnessed of a man, just in the sense which is employed so powerfully in the New Testament (e.g. Heb. xi.). See a Galatian honorary dedication, *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, 1883, p. 19: Σιλονανὸν Ἡλίου... [τε]ιμηθέντα [ἐπὶ] ὁ φυλῆς κ[αὶ] ματυ[ρ]ηθέντα ὑπὸ βουλῆς κ.τ.λ. And Wood's *Inscription from the Great Theatre*, No. 1, Column 6, lines 15 and 21: *μαρτυρίας καὶ τιμῆς ἀξιούμενον*.

Φιλοτιμεῖσθαι, φιλοτιμία.

I conclude with *φιλοτιμία*, *φιλοτιμεῖσθαι* perhaps the very commonest words in Greek honorary decrees, so common that it would be difficult to find an honorary decree without them (see e.g. *C.I.A.* ii. *passim*, or any

volume of Greek decrees). The following are specimens of the usual phraseology: *ἐπαυέσαι εὐσεβείας ἕνεκα τῆς εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς καὶ φιλοτιμίας τῆς εἰς τὴν βουλὴν καὶ τὸν δῆμον—τοὺς φιλοτιμουμένους πρὸς (εἰς or περὶ) τὸν δῆμον—ἐπεμψάν τὴν πομπήν* (superintended the procession) *ὡς ἠδύνατο φιλοτιμότατα*. I quite endorse the note of Dr. Field on Romans xv 20. The meaning of the verb was clearly to act with public spirit, with devotion to the public and the success of the cause in hand. The transition to actions in which public devotion was not possible was easy and natural, so that *φιλοτιμία* scarcely means more than *σπουδή*, with which word indeed it is frequently conjoined in public decrees (*C.I.A.* ii. p. 242; *C.I.G.* 3595.) Similarly Julius Pollux, in his dedication of his *Onomasticon*, says of it: *πεφιλοτιμήμαι γὰρ οὐ τοσοῦτον εἰς πλῆθος ὅσους εἰς κάλλους ἐκλογὴν*; as we should say 'my aim throughout my work has been such and such.'

E. L. HICKS.

ON SOME FAULTS IN MILTON'S LATIN POETRY.

IN A LETTER TO A FRIEND.

MY DEAR PROFESSOR,

It is now some years ago since I had the pleasure of receiving from you a letter in which, referring to a false quantity I had mentioned as occurring in Buchanan's *Alcaic Ode, Maiae Calendae*, so highly commended by Dr. Johnson and others¹—viz. the participle 'dicatae' used with the first syllable long (*Miscell.* xi. 3), you expressed your surprise that Ruddiman, in his *Vindication of Buchanan*, though he deals with some other charges of false quantity, does not touch the one I had pointed out; and you added: 'the more I consider it, the more I am astonished that such a scholar and poet as Buchanan should have committed such an enormity. Do you know of anything equally gross in any other eminent author?' I have kept your letter by me because I anticipated that a time might come sooner or later when I might wish to give an answer to the question proposed in these last words fuller and more satisfactory than it was in my power to send you at the moment. And such a time has now arrived.

I have always been an admirer of Milton's

¹ Wordsworth (*Memoirs*, ii. 469) speaks of it as 'equal in sentiment, if not in elegance, to anything in Horace.'

Latin poems, who, of all English writers in that department, is, I think, most worthy to be classed with our great literary Scotchman; and having lately read them again somewhat critically, I am tempted to give you the result of my perusal in regard more particularly to the point on which you formerly appealed to me in Buchanan's case. Not that I have any intention of going into them so minutely as the learned Dr. Charles Burney, in his well-known critique (1790), has gone into Milton's two or three short copies of Greek verses; but I shall bring forward enough to answer your inquiry; and at the same time to show that as a Latin verse-writer Milton certainly is not entitled to cast a stone at his Scottish brother on the score of superior exemption from blemishes:

'quas aut incuria fudit,
Aut humana parum cavit Natura;'

and that if Ruddiman was not so sharp-sighted as he ought to have been in his examination of Buchanan, T. Warton and other scholarly critics upon Milton are no less liable to the same charge.

Meanwhile, remembering that I am writing to a learned Professor of Humanity in the

University of which Buchanan was so great an ornament, I shall feel that I am not called upon to enter into much explanation; but may be content merely to name 'the head and front of the offence' which I shall have to indicate in each particular case. Remembering, too, that there was a time when the works of Milton and Buchanan were ordered to be publicly burnt together in the Schools at Oxford (see Macaulay's *Hist.* v. 97), I can well imagine how naturally you may be inclined to smile at this malignant attempt of a modern Oxonian *Tory* and *rank Prelatist* to hang them both as literary culprits on the same critical gibbet!

1. First then, if you desire a gross false quantity which shall be fully a match for Buchanan's 'dicatae,' we know that Milton in his fifth *Elegy* on the very same subject as Buchanan's *Ode to May-Day*, and in T. Warton's judgment 'far superior to it,' wrote and published in the first edition, 1645, 'quotannis,' with the last syllable short. For this, Salmasius, his violent antagonist, did not spare him. Consequently, in the second edition of 1673, the line (30) was altered, by the substitution of 'perennis,' as it now stands. But we also know that another false quantity scarcely, if at all, less 'enormous'—viz. 'p̄ruere,' with the first syllable short—is still to be seen in his hexameters 'On the Fifth of November,' (*Sylv.* ii. 165). T. Warton indeed suggests that a defence may be found for it 'by reading it as the *u* consonant; for which (he says) there are authorities.' He refers, I suppose, to cases such as 'pituita' (Hor. Pers.) and perhaps 'fortuito' (Juv.) where 'u' may be taken to represent our 'w.' But I doubt whether these or any other of the examples given in Ramsay's *Prosody*, p. 132 seq., Carey, p. 172 seq. are sufficient to justify what Milton has written, and I cannot suppose that he himself contemplated any such justification.

2. Again, no defence can be alleged for making the second syllable of 'sentis' short, as is done in the copy of *choliambics* (*Sylv.* vii. 3) addressed by Milton to his friend Salsilli. Even if he forgot the rule which forbids such a short syllable, he ought to have remembered the example of Horace—

'Sentis, ac veluti stet volucris dies,'

or of Lucretius—

'Naturam rerum ac persentis utilitatem.'

3. And this brings me to the case of the two copies of *choliambics* or *seazons*, in which, though both together they consist of

only forty-nine lines, Milton has broken the invariable law of Latin prosody, which requires an iambus in the fifth foot, no less than eighteen times. Terentianus Maurus gives us the rule very distinctly, and having stated the reason for it, viz. that two spondees may not come together, he warns against its violation:

'Quum tantum iambus hoc loco probe poni,
Aliusque nullus rite possit admitti.' (693 seq.)

Warton and Todd both speak of the rule as 'indispensable'; but the latter suggests that Milton 'might perhaps think himself justified by the license admitted into Greek seazons.' It is true that Hipponax, who most probably invented this kind of verse, and that Babrius, who adopted it in his metrical version of *Æsop's Fables*, occasionally allowed themselves to use a spondee in the fifth place; and it is also true that such lines have been deservedly stigmatized by grammarians as '*Ischiorrhogic*,' or 'broken-backed.' But what should we think of a modern Latin versifier, who, in writing sapphics, should introduce a trochee instead of a spondee in the second place (as Sappho has sometimes done), or in writing *alcaics*, should, in the third line of the stanza make the third foot an iambus, instead of a spondee (as Alcaeus in his few fragments that remain has invariably done); now that Horace, in improving and naturalizing those metres, has uniformly repudiated the said practices; just as Catullus and Martial, whenever they have composed seazons, have rejected the broken-backed alternatives occasionally admitted by Hipponax and Babrius? Even the license which Catullus has taken more than once in his sapphics in imitation of his Greek model, we consider inadmissible in a modern writer, because Horace subsequently abstained from it altogether.

4. Again, I have noted down no less than twenty-seven instances in which Milton has violated another well-known canon of Latin prosody which forbids a short vowel to stand before a word beginning with *sc*, *sp*, or *st*. The law in question (about which there had been a good deal of bungling since Dawes misstated it in his *Miscellanea Critica*) has been thoroughly cleared up by the late Professor Ramsay (p. 260 seq.), who, after a full examination of all the evidence bearing upon the point, decides that 'this collocation ought never to be introduced into modern Latin poetry.' I confess I have been surprised to find that an ear so nice and delicate as Milton's should have allowed

him to trespass so frequently in this respect. But then I have to bring the same charge even against Vincent Bourne, in whose Latin verses—scarcely more numerous, I suppose, than Milton's—when I last read them I detected thirty-one examples of the same offence. Milton's editor, T. Warton, even if he observed the mistake—which does not I think appear in any of his notes—could not afford to be very severe upon it, having been guilty of the same himself in his beautiful copy of Latin hexameters on *Mons Catharinae*, where we read a verse beginning—

'Corpore spumantemque,' &c.

And it is amusing to observe how the more recent editor of the elegant Aldine edition of Milton does indeed, on three several occasions, draw the reader's attention to the fact of 'the vowel made short before *sc*,' in the self-same little note thrice repeated *verbatim* (vol. iii. 260, 275, 295); but has *nothing to say upon the twenty-four other instances of the same fault!* Todd is not less merciful or unobservant than Warton, for he also has passed over every one of the twenty-seven passages *sicco pede!*

So much then for the prosodical peccadilloes of our great author. I am afraid we shall not find him more immaculate when we turn to his use of words.

1. For example, what would you say to any of your students who should bring to you in an exercise such a word as 'surdeat'? See *Eleg.* vii. 90. I suspect you would tell him that you had heard of 'surdesco' but never of 'surdeo.'

2. Or, again, what would you say if an attempt were made to palm off upon you the verb 'liceo' (to be lawful) used in any other form than that of the impersonal 'licet'? And yet Milton writes (*Eleg.* vi. 53):—

'Talibus inde licent convivia larga poetis.'

3. Neither do I imagine you would approve of the verb 'superemineo' being made to govern a *dative* case, as it does in Milton, *Eleg.* vii. 61, whereas in the Roman poets it always appears with an *accusative*.

4. Again, in *Eleg.* vi. 63, and *Sylv.* vi. 51, Milton puts a *genitive* case after 'vacans,' whereas, so far as I know, in classical authors that word is always used either absolutely, or with an *ablative*, although 'vacuus' is found with both cases.

5. I wish you would be so good as to look at *Eleg.* v. 27, and tell me whether you

do not think we ought to read 'utrinque' instead of 'utrique,' at the end of the former of these lines:

'Urbe ego, tu silvâ, simul incipiamus utrique:
Et simul adventum veris uterque canat.'

I am aware that 'utrique' is sometimes, though rarely, used in the plural of two individuals, like 'ambo'; but here it is peculiarly awkward, with the singular following in the next verse.

6. Once more, I have little doubt you will agree with me that there must be something wrong in *Sylv.* ix. 168, where the construction requires an accusative case, *per epegegesin*; and yet we have 'Merlini dolus.' Is it possible that Milton could have fancied at the moment that 'dolus' was a neuter noun?

In pointing out the foregoing blemishes both of versification and grammar, I do not forget that Milton's Latin verses were composed when he was quite young, *i.e.* between the ages of seventeen and twenty inclusive. But then we are obliged also to remember that he himself first gave them to the world in 1645, when he was thirty-seven, and that he republished them in 1673, the year before his death. As I have said, I admire them upon the whole very much; but I think I have shown that the remark thrown out by Johnson with reference to one of the compositions, the copy of seasons addressed to Salsilli, viz. that 'it is not secure against a stern grammarian,' must not be confined to that one production. Probably you yourself, as better fitted for the task, would have found cause to extend the application of the same censure considerably further than I have done.

I am,

Yours very faithfully,

C. WORDSWORTH,
Bp. of St. Andrews.

BISHOPSHALL, ST. ANDREWS.

P.S.—Under the head of false quantities, I have not named 'melös,' *Sylv.* vi. 37, nor 'egō' (which Ramsay utterly condemns, p. 61), *ibid.* 109, because something may be said for them both on the score of *cæsuræ*; neither have I included 'mēlos,' to be found twice at the end of a *sæzon* (viz. *Epigr.* ix. 8, *Sylv.* vii. 22); because Milton, no doubt, had Persius's *Prologue* in mind—which indeed in the former place he has manifestly imitated; but in Persius—as you will know—the best editions, to avoid the false quantity, now read 'Pegaseium pectar.'

REVIEWS.

The Iliad. Edited, with English Notes and Introduction, by WALTER LEAF, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Vol. I. Books I.—XII. London: Macmillan & Co., 1886. 14s.

MR. LEAF announces in his Preface that 'the object of the present edition of the *Iliad* is to offer a guide to students anxious to know more of Homer than they can learn from elementary schoolbooks.' He may be congratulated on having attained this object, and on having done much more.

He has given us a book which is valuable as a monument of his own ripe scholarship, and which will be especially prized by English readers, because it makes accessible to them many of the most recent and most important results of German erudition. Modern Homeric literature grows apace: and it is difficult to overstate the debt of gratitude we owe to a student who will pick out for our benefit the pearls that are set deep in large books, or scattered widely in monographs and periodicals.

The text that Mr. Leaf prints agrees, as he tells us in his Introduction, in most points with Hentze's revision of Dindorf's edition (*Teubn. Series*, ed. 5); and while he refers to the *apparatus criticus* of La Roche, he passes a censure not undeservedly severe on its incompleteness and inaccuracy.

But Mr. Leaf scarcely touches the question of textual criticism himself, and gives only the briefest reference to codd. A, B, C, D, and Townl., remarking that 'none of the other complete MSS. are of special importance.' It is therefore difficult to estimate the grounds of his preference for particular readings, when he accepts them on the vague authority of 'all good MSS.,' 'best MSS.,' 'all the best MSS.,' 'five MSS.,' 'some MSS.,' 'most MSS.,' 'nearly all our MSS.,' 'La Roche and others': though occasionally he presumes a much more detailed knowledge on the part of his readers; as, for example, in the note on K 398, 'βουλευοίτε . . . ἐθέλοιτε ACDH; βουλεύονται . . . ἐθέλουσι GL Mori, C (*man. sec.*) and A as a variant.' Mr. Leaf, in his Preface, confesses that 'when once the strict limits of a verbal commentary are passed, it is hard to

NOS. II. & III. VOL. I.

know which path to choose . . .'; and, doubtless, he would be the first to acknowledge that the difficulty is at least as great in deciding how much to say, and how much to leave unsaid, in the matter of textual criticism.

He has enriched his commentary with very full explanations of Homeric 'Realien.' On matters connected with the armour of the Greek and Trojan heroes, Mr. Leaf is an original authority of no mean merit, as he has shown by his important contributions to the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*. The recent discoveries at Hissarlik, Mykenae, and Tiryns are freely drawn upon for purposes of illustration; and Helbig's valuable work on Homeric Archaeology is constantly cited. One passage may be noted where Mr. Leaf seems to have made some confusion in quoting this authority. In A 246 the σκήπτρον of Achilles is described as χρυσείοις ἡλίοισι πεπαρμένον, and the note runs thus, 'The golden nails fastened the blade to the handle; cf. A 29, and a full explanation of the whole question in Helbig, H. E. pp. 238 foll.' But there is no blade to attach to a σκήπτρον, and the parallel passage quoted in A 29, refers not to a σκήπτρον but to a ξίφος, which is properly described in Helbig, 238 foll. The discussion of the σκήπτρον will be found on page 278, where it is classed among 'die mit Nägeln beschlagenen Holzarbeiten.'

Sometimes Mr. Leaf seems to modify his views as he goes on, without making the necessary correction; as, for example, in the note on E 722, we read that 'the body of the car was very light, and when not in use was taken to pieces, and put upon a stand; see Θ 441.' But in the commentary on the later passage, it is decided that 'such a construction would seriously interfere with the strength of a chariot.'

In his next edition Mr. Leaf will do well to verify his cross-references, and to bring the orthography of proper names to a more exact harmony. It is the solid excellence of the work that makes us jealous of the *naevi* on the *egregium corpus*.

Mr. Leaf is a conscientious and trustworthy guide in dealing with grammatical

E

constructions, and analysis of sentences. He has a clear view of his own, and is well abreast of the latest studies in dialectical forms and comparative syntax. Perhaps a more rigid exercise of self-denial would be wiser in questions of etymology. Fanciful derivations, in spite of their charm, are the will-o'-the-wisps of the misty marsh, and too often lead us deeper into the quagmire.

The very few pages assigned in the Introduction to the Origin of the Poems must be regarded as the net result of Mr. Leaf's studies, compressed into the narrowest possible form by the inexorable laws of space. But he makes substantial atonement by the excellent introductions prefixed to each book, on the model of those given in the Ameis-Hentze edition. The relation of the different books to the general poem is clearly set out, and the special difficulties and inconsistencies honestly dealt with. It is satisfactory to see the announcement that the second volume of Mr. Leaf's edition is 'in preparation.'

W. W. MERRY.

The Seven against Thebes of Aeschylus. With an Introduction, Commentary, and Translation, by A. W. VERRALL, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. London: Macmillan & Co., 1887. 7s. 6d.

MR. VERRALL'S edition of the *Seven against Thebes* is highly interesting, and, in a word, an important contribution to classical learning. The notes are full of instruction and suggestion; and he who has a taste for lexicography will find much to enter, sometimes with a query, in his interleaved Liddell and Scott. The translation is a work of the highest art, breathing the very spirit of Aeschylus. Though not in metrical form it is genuine poetry; and will be recognized as such by all who do not believe that metre in its narrowest sense, as distinguished from rhythm, is of the essence of poetry; by all who hold that the Psalms in the Book of Common Prayer are true poetry, and refuse that name to the New Version by Brady and Tate. It is a worthy successor to Prof. Jebb's masterly versions of Sophocles.

But all the excellences of this edition will not redeem it from the charge that it pursues a false method, unless Mr. Verrall succeeds in commending to the acceptance of scholars his views about strophic correspondence. If it is true that to *πίλαις ἐβδόμῃς*, 118, we have a sufficiently close antistrophic response in *στόνων αὐτῶν*, 132,

then it follows that Hermann's *στόνων ἀπ' αὐτῶν* is wrong, because unnecessary, and, further, that a great part of the scholarship brought to bear on the choral portions of Greek Tragedy since the revival of learning has been labour thrown away, the pursuit of an *ignis fatuus*. Mr. Verrall's method revolutionises criticism in an important department of it. He adheres to his principles boldly. He gives in his text *μαινομένα καρδίᾳ*, 766, as the strophic equivalent to *καὶ σφε σιδαρόνῳ*, 773. Now this is a case which will serve as a test of his theory. Did the copyist of the Medicean find *κραδίᾳ*, and (being ignorant of the existence of strophic correspondence) write *καρδίᾳ*, the form with which he was more familiar? Or did he write down *καρδίᾳ* because he found *καρδίᾳ* in the MS. from which he was copying; strophic correspondence, as we understand it, having no existence in the choral portions of the plays of Aeschylus, but being 'a fond thing vainly imagined' by all modern editors and by many ancient scholiasts? On the answer to this question must largely depend our estimate of the degree of excellence attained by Mr. Verrall's edition. If I agreed with his doctrine as to the limits of strophic correspondence, expounded with characteristic vigour and skill in Appendix I, I should feel constrained by parity of reasoning to give up the rule of the pause, if not the rule which governs the place of the anapaest in the senarius. But I do not feel disposed to accept his view. The copyist, I believe, finding *κραδίᾳ* in this passage changed it to *καρδίᾳ*, and finding *παρβασιαν*, 729, changed it to *παρβασιαν*, because he did not see any reason why he should write *κραδίᾳ* and *παρβασιαν* (forms unfamiliar to him), not knowing that there was any need for close metrical correspondence between strophe and antistrophe. In just the same way the copyist of Eur. *Heracles*. 529,

καὶ στεμματοῦτε καὶ κατάρχεσθαι δοκεῖ,

did not see, not knowing the rule of the pause, why he should not make the construction simpler by writing

καὶ στεμματοῦτε καὶ κατάρχεσθ' εἰ δοκεῖ.

Mr. Verrall has said nothing about the rule of the pause, but here too he would seem to revolt from the school of Porson, for in verse 13 he introduces a palpable violation of the great Cambridge scholar's law in reading,

ῶραν ἔχων θ' ἕκαστος ὡς τις συμπερηής.

Mr. Verrall's critical method has undergone a considerable change—and certainly

a change in the right direction—since the appearance of his brilliant edition of the *Medea*. There he emends often brilliantly, but sometimes perhaps too boldly, guided chiefly by considerations of taste, metre, and language. Here his ‘corrections are chiefly in the division of the letters into words, and in the accentuation.’ Of these corrections the most striking are ἐκθέων for ἐκ θεῶν 23, οὐ κενός for οὐχ ἑνός 100, φονῶν for φόνων 124, ἐκτός for ἐκτός 251, ἐπανδρὰς for ἐπ’ ἄνδρας 269, ὁδόν for ὁδόν 322, τῷ διαπτέσθαι for τῷ δ’ ἰάπτειν 531, θ’ ἰλόντος for θέλοντος 601, ἐξέξω’ ἂν γὰρ Οἰδίπουν κατ’ εὐγμᾶτα for ἐξέξωσαν...κατεύγμᾶτα 696, Λαί’ οὐ for Λαίων 828, ἄγος for ἄγος 1008. The MS. reading is vindicated with uniform adroitness but varying degrees of cogency against a generally accepted emendation in the notes on γυνὴ σωτήριος 211, τὴν μακρὰν πάλιν μολεῖν, 600, συμφοίτω φρενῶν 648, ἐπ’ εὐναίᾳ χθονός 998, οὐ διατετρίχται 1038.

It would be tedious to give one’s own judgment on each of these corrections in detail. But one may perhaps make a comment on a few of them. ‘War in sallies’ would be very strangely expressed by πόλεμος ἐκθέων 23, and requires a stronger support than the remark that ἐκ θεῶν does not suit the character of the speaker (Eteocles). On οὐχ ἑνός δορός 100 is it not too bold to write ‘the MS. appears to me impossible; not one is no synonym for many’? In Latin it certainly is. One calls to mind at once Horace’s *consulque non unus anni*, and is not the usage whereby οὐχ εἷς = πολλοί almost explained in Eur. *Med.* 952,

εὐδαιμονήσει δ’ οὐχ ἓν ἀλλὰ μυρία,
and very nearly, if not exactly, paralleled by οὐχ ἓνα ῥυθμὸν | κακῶν ἔχούσας, *Suppl.* 94, στεφάνων οὐ μία χροιά, *Cycl.* 517? Moreover the figure is a characteristic one in Greek. Just as οὐχ εἷς means ‘not merely one,’ so οὐκ ἴσην is ‘not merely even,’ that is ‘more than even’ in Soph. *O. T.* 810, and οὐχ ὁμοία Thuc. i. 35 (quoted by Jebb) is ‘not merely similar,’ that is ‘more serious.’ The reading φονῶν 124 is an immense improvement. Mr. Verrall’s explanation of this passage is full of poetic feeling. For other passages characterized by robust and at the same time highly tasteful interpretation I would point especially to the strophe and antistrophe 332–355, and to the very difficult 670 ff. And I think he has rightly explained 614,

παρ’ ἀσπίδος γυμνωθέν ἀρπάσαι δόρυ.
‘to seize the moment when the spear is uncovered by the shield.’

In 251 ἐκτός for ἐκτός seems impossible. If such a verbal existed in classical Greek it must have occurred oftener than once; and Mr. Verrall should at least have pointed to other places in which ἐκτός has usurped its place. Moreover, to get out from among the statues and go home, is the very course which Eteocles has urged on the maidens of the Chorus already more than once, for instance in 218,

σὸν δ’ αὖ τὸ σιγᾶν καὶ μένειν εἴσω δόμων.

The very ingenious reading ἐπανδρὰς 269 would seem at first sight to be discredited by the subsequent μολῶν in 271; however, μολῶν, like λαβῶν, is often tacked on to a principal verb without exercising any real influence on the meaning of the passage. But ἐπανδρὰς is open to a much more serious criticism than this. Would Eteocles have undertaken to ‘run back again,’ as if he were a mere ἄγγελος? Would such a phrase be fitting in the mouth of an Aeschylean protagonist? Would it have been consistent with the dignity of Eteocles, and inoffensive to the taste of an Athenian audience?

As to 531,

ὥς πλείστ’ ἐπ’ ἀνδρὶ τῷδ’ ἰάπτειναι βελή,

it seems highly probable that this verse was inserted by some copyist or scholiast who thought that the φῶτα Καδμείων ἓνα borne by the Sphinx was a living Theban, and that the intention was to expose him to the darts of his Theban countrymen. But ὥς with the infinitive would signify *consequence*; so that the verse could only describe what was the *result* in the engagement of the use of this device. The interpolator forgot that the battle has not yet begun. It is absurd therefore to describe here the *effect* or *consequence* of the use of this device by Parthenopaeus. The verse should be expunged; every attempt to emend it is a failure.

There is no correction of Mr. Verrall’s which seems likely to command more unqualified assent than his view about the reading and meaning of 600, 601,

τείνονσι πομπὴν τὴν μακρὰν πάλιν μολεῖν,
Διὸς θ’ ἰλόντος συγκαθελκυσθήσεται,

‘They are bound on that journey whence ’tis an over-long way back, and he, when Zeus takes them, shall also be dragged down.’ Thus πάλιν of the Medicean is preserved, the infinitive μολεῖν depends on μακρὰν as an explanation, ‘long to return from,’ and there is no reason to assume with the later MSS. that τὴν μακρὰν πόλιν could refer to Hades.

I cannot help regarding συμφοίτω φρενῶν 648, ‘fellow-travellers-out-of-their-minds’ as

a grotesque way of expressing 'his mad pair of wanderers,' the figures of Right and the Warrior on the shield. If we met such a phrase in Aristophanes should we not regard φρεῖων as a case of παρὰ προσδοκίαν, and translate 'These comrades twain together going—mad'?

Of his conjectures proper, as we may call those in which, while adhering very closely to the MS. tradition, he however permits himself some latitude in the substitution of one letter for another, the most striking is his correction of οὐπὲρ τοῖς νέοις 1002, where from the note of the scholiast, 'This is imitated from

εἰς οἰωνὸς ἄριστος ἀμύνεσθαι περὶ πάτρης,'

he restores

τέθνηκεν οἷσπερ ὄρνέοις θνήσκειν καλόν,

a fine verse, and one well worthy of Aeschylus, if we could only be sure that ὄρνεον would be rightly used in the sense of *omen*. It is not safe to infer this from the fact that ὄρνις and οἰωνός mean *omen*. In matters of language Nomos is king, and his decrees are often as arbitrary as they are irreversible. It would be hard to give any reason why we always speak of an *eagle* eye, and an *aquiline* nose. A foreigner might not observe any impropriety of usage in

The Martyr first whose *aquiline* eye
Could pierce beyond the grave;

but we see that the substitution of *aquiline* for *eagle* makes the verse absurd. Can we be sure that ὄρνεον in the sense of *omen* would not have been ludicrous to an Athenian audience?

Strikingly ingenious is his view of the desperate passage 769 ff., where for κρείσσω τέκνων δ' ἀπ' ὀμμάτων he proposes χρυσοτέχνων πωμάτων, and advances a theory which gives a new and touching significance to σιδαρονόμφη χερὶ in the same context. In ἱρὸν δὲ μόνῃ for ἱερὸν εὐμενῇ 254 I cannot see that there is satisfactory evidence that the scholiast found μόνῃ in his text; his note reads rather as if he had μᾶ before him. On 628, while fully agreeing with Mr. Verrall that πάγχυ qualifies the name Polynices, I would not with him change βία to βία, but would regard Πολυνείκης βία as a periphrasis for Πολυνείκης, πάγχυ qualifying the periphrasis just as if it had been the simple name. The emendation which seems to rank in point of ingenuity and interest next to ὄρνέοις 1002 and ἑταῖρός 269, is χηρώματα for χειρώματα 1013. It is hard to accept χηρώματα as meaning *mourners*, on the analogy of παιδείματα Eur. Hipp. 11, especially as χήρωμα is

not extant; but at all events Mr. Verrall has shown that τυμβοχόα χειρώματα has no meaning. We owe much gratitude to an editor for opening our eyes to the true character of a phrase in which we have carelessly acquiesced. If he has not restored the true reading, he has at least displaced the false.

Of the corrections put forward in the notes, but not introduced into the text, the best would seem to be κατηλείσασμι' ἐγὼ for ἀληθείσασμι' ἐγὼ on 549. There would thus be a characteristic allusion to the οὐ κατηλείσαν μάχην in the preceding speech, and a play on the verb which in the answer of Eteocles would bear the meaning to *cheat*: 'and if the gods will, 'tis I will prove the cozenner.'

On 415, 416

οὐδὲ τὴν Διὸς

ἔριν πέδῳ σκίψασαν ἐμποδὼν σχεθεῖν

Mr. Verrall, objecting to the omission of the object of σχεθεῖν, the absence of ἄν, and 'the name Έριν, *Discord*, an inappropriate personage and not properly described as τὴν Διὸς, proposes

ἐραί νιν ἄν σκίψασαν ἐμποδὼν σχεθεῖν,

ἐραί being a locative related to ἐράζε as χαμαί is related to χαμάζε. But is any change necessary, except (perhaps) Dindorf's πέδοι? Τὴν Διὸς ἔριν means Δία ἐρίσαντα; ἐρίζειν is the word for a personal quarrel between two (διαστήτην ἐρίσαντε, Il. i. 6); the whole meaning is that not Zeus himself, if he made the quarrel his own, and came down and confronted Capaneus, would avail to check his course. If the object of σχεθεῖν and the conditional particle must be introduced, I would rather read,

ἔριν πέδοι σκίψασαν ἄν πόδα σχεθεῖν.

I doubt if there is ground for ascribing to Eteocles so much subtle irony, covert innuendo, and cultured scepticism, as Mr. Verrall is disposed to find in his utterances. Would so delicate a piece of embroidery have been wrought into a web so stout and even rough? Mr. Verrall recoils from anything which is commonplace; now there must in every play be some commonplace lines, and an editor may waste labour in seeking in such passages a deep and recondite meaning. This recoil from what is commonplace, and even from what is generally accepted, seconded by a very exceptional subtlety of mind, which often bears rich fruit in emendation and interpretation, sometimes leads him into surprising views about the meanings of

common words. Lord Tennyson in *Elaine* uses a strange metaphor,

As when we dwell upon a word we know,
Repeating, till the word we know so well
Becomes a wonder, and we know not why :

it must be some such state of mind as the poet contemplates in this passage, which leads Mr. Verrall to make πόλις in 233 mean a *revolution* or *roll* ; or to hold that in 263 'there is a grim play...upon the two senses of ἐσθήματα (*garments*) and ἐσθήματα *things put in or among* from τίθημι'; or in 259 to put into the mouth of Eteocles such a word as οὔδατα, Boeotian for ὕδατα, on the theory that 'the local form in the local name is a picturesque touch'; or to construe 577 f. so completely in defiance of the order of the words; or to take Ἀχαιοὺ θεόθεν together in 311 and explain 'of Achæan religion'; or to propose *πρωίξει* in *Choeph.* 927.

But Mr. Verrall's subtlety is so often the best of guides that we must not complain if it sometimes carries him too far. To be observant is one of the hall-marks of a scholar; and he is observant in the highest degree. And so great is his enthusiasm for letters, and so remarkable his brilliancy of style, that he never fails to awaken and hold the attention of his readers, and to quicken and refine their interest in the masterpieces of Ancient Literature.

ROBERT Y. TYRRELL.

Sophocles. The Plays and Fragments. Part II. The Oedipus Coloneus, with Critical Notes, Commentary, and Translation in English Prose, by R. C. JEBB, Doctor of Letters, Professor of Greek in the University of Glasgow, &c. Cambridge University Press, 1885. 12s. 6d.

THOUGH it is now some time since the appearance of Professor Jebb's second volume we are perhaps not too late to record with warm approbation the latest instalment of his important work. The reception which has been given to it discharges us from the necessity of general remarks; even if any general remark were applicable, except that it is careful and finished to the smallest detail, and that every page of it contains matter for careful reading.

Criticism must find subject-matter in what is debatable, and I propose to select for brief examination one or two of the places where examination may still be productive. Indeed Professor Jebb has nothing to lose by such a selection; for

nowhere does he better display his firm grasp of principle and singular clearness of exposition than where he draws the line round the field, *within* which search must be confined. In Greek grammar, especially in the grammar of Sophocles, it needs a clear head to apprehend the point at which seeming subtlety becomes real confusion. In this respect, Professor Jebb appears to me to have scarcely an equal among the commentators with whom I am acquainted; and the consequence is that, even where his conclusions may not satisfy, he is immensely helpful in disembarassing the problem.

We will take for the first example, *Oed. Col.* 9 :

ἀλλ', ὃ τέκνον, θάκοισιν εἰ τινα βλέπεις
ἢ πρὸς βεβήλοισι ἢ πρὸς ἄλσεσιν θεῶν
στήσον με κἀξιδρύσων ὥς πυθώμεθα
ἔπον ποτ' ἐσμέν· μανθάνει γὰρ ἦκομεν
ξένοι πρὸς ἀστῶν, ἂν δ' ἀκούσωμεν τελεῖν.

The editor accepts with the majority the corrections *θάκῃσιν* and *πυθώμεθα* : but he takes the pains to *show*, by a summary of the conditions under which a final sentence in the optative may follow a primary tense, that this example is not within those conditions. Both the classification and the conclusion are correct; and their value is in no way diminished, if we are nevertheless dissatisfied with the subjunctive, as we may be. For in the first place the assumed corruption is not of the commonest or most probable kind. It stands, for example, on a very different footing from the frequent *itacistic* confusion of *η*, *ει*, and even *οι*. But a more serious difficulty lies in the rendering of the text as emended: 'If thou seest any resting-place (*θάκῃσιν*), . . . stay me and set me down, that we may enquire where we are.' In this translation, what do we do with *ποτέ*? The addition of *ποτέ* to the interrogative has a regular and well-known force, roughly represented by the English *where in the world?* *ποῦ ποτ' εἰμί*; is the question of one completely lost. To take ready examples, Orestes in Euripides (*Or.* 215) returning to his senses after his fit, asks, *πόθεν ποτ' ἦλθον δαῖρο*; *πῶς δ' ἀφικόμην*; *ἀμνημονῶ γάρ*: and Heracles in the like circumstances (*Her. Fur.* 1105) *ποῦ ποτ' ὦν ἀμνηχῶ*; But how could Oedipus and Antigone desire to put such a question? They are not in any sense *lost*. They do not indeed know the name of the village of Colonus; and Oedipus, being blind, does not know whether they are just now at a village or in the open country (v. 2); but they know perfectly well *ἔπον ποτ' εἰσί*, and indeed much more. They are on the road

to Athens, and have already been told, almost too often for Oedipus' patience, that they are in sight of the city (v. 25). Only Oedipus is too weary to proceed further, and desires, if there is a seat near, to be conducted to it at once, *whether it appears to be on sacred ground or profane*: and to this doubt refers the sole embarrassment which his words express. To such a situation the question *ποῦ ποτ' ἔσμεν*; is surely quite unsuitable. It would ask what they know, and would not ask what they want to know.

Again, as to *ἐξιδρύσον*? With the MS. reading *θάκουσι*,¹ this word is a superfluous repetition of *θάκουσι στήσον*, *place me in some seat*, and if, with the editor and others, we remove this fault by writing *θάκην*, then *στήσον* itself becomes a difficulty, as is sufficiently apparent in his careful translation. Again, as to the preposition in *ἐξιδρύω*,—a compound which we should expect to mean 'seat me away,' or 'apart from,' or 'out of' something, as it does in the only other extant example.² Here also the editor clears the ground by dismissing the notion that we can supply 'from the road.' He himself treats *ἐξιδρύσον* as equivalent to *ἰδρύσον*, relying on the analogy of '*ἐξορθώω* (to render *ὀρθόν*)'. This is perhaps conceivable; but *make me seated* is rather a cumbersome expression for *seat me*. Should we, apart from this passage, think it a likely form? For these reasons I think that the explanation is still to seek, and that we must start again from the position that *ὡς πυθόμεθα* cannot be a final sentence; to which we must add that *ὅπου ποτ' ἔσμεν* cannot be a question depending on *πυθόμεθα*. Of *ὅπου ποτ' ἔσμεν* there is but one other

possible construction: we must take it with *στήσον με θάκουσι*—*put me in some seat, here wherever we are*, whether, that is to say, the place appears to be sacred or profane. But in that case *καὶ ἐξιδρύσον ὡς πυθόμεθα* must be a parenthesis. I submit that it is, that *ἐξιδρύσον* (τοῦ θάκου) means 'remove me from this seat to another', and that *ὡς πυθόμεθα* is not a final clause but *modal*, meaning 'according as we learn', i.e. 'according to the result of enquiry'. By a familiar kind of ellipse, 'remove me according to the result of enquiry' stands in Greek for 'remove me or not according to the result of enquiry', the alternative being understood. We have a parallel in Euripides *Med.* 330–331.

MH. φεῦ φεῦ, βροτοῖς ἔρωτες ὡς κακὸν μέγα.
KP. ὅπως ἂν, οἶμαι, καὶ παραστῶσιν τύχαι.

i.e. 'Love is a curse (or a blessing), according as fortune attends it', and see Eur. *Tro.* 1051. Now in general clauses of this kind the use of the optative (without *ἂν*) or of the subjunctive (usually with *ἂν*) is determined, in the more archaic syntax of the poets, not by the tense of the principal sentence at all, but by other considerations. The difference is not so easy to explain as to feel: but with the optative the event is more vaguely, remotely, and uncertainly conceived.³ Here therefore the optative, besides having the practical advantage *that the clause cannot be mistaken for a final clause*, is also right in feeling; since the pressing thought is the immediate need of repose, and the question of moving afterwards is relegated to a more distant plane. This effect is further aided by the parenthetic form of the clause; and for the same reason the locative *θάκουσι* and the words *ὅπου ποτ' ἔσμεν* have the places of emphasis, these containing the essence of what is said. Logically *μανθάνειν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.* is connected with the parenthesis, to which there is no objection, since *γὰρ* does not, like the English *for*, make any close link with what immediately precedes, and is more accurately represented by *indeed*, or *you know*. Somewhat similar, though not precisely, is the arrangement in Eur. *Alc.* 472–475. In English, where parentheses are much more sparingly used, we should prefer a different arrangement; but for the present purpose we may perhaps render thus: 'My child, if thou seest any seat, whether on profane ground or by

¹ I take the construction to be *θάκουσι στήσον με, εἴ τινα (θάκον) βλέπεις*. The passage from the plural to the singular is natural and even necessary. The difference between *θάκος* and *θάκοι* (with singular meaning), where they differ, is that *θάκος* is the material *seat* or thing sat upon, as a *bench*, or *chair*, *θάκοι* a *sitting-place*, a seat considered generally or in the abstract. Here therefore the plural and the singular are each correctly used; *θάκον στήσον* might have seemed to indicate a particular seat, and on the other hand *εἴ τινας βλέπεις* (since with *βλέπεις* the conception must be material) would have suggested a number of seats, which is not the intention. For the construction of the locative *θάκουσι* compare *Oed. Tyr.* 20 *ἀγοραῖσι θαρεῖ*: it seems here to be indispensable, if *στήσον* is not to be otiose; *στήσον με* could only mean 'stop me', which is surely the same thing as 'let me rest'.

² Eur. *fr.* 877, *τηλοῦ γὰρ οἴκων βίον ἐξιδρύσων*, cited by the editor. He adds that there 'it is the context which fixes this sense.' This is true, and the passage certainly does not prove that *ἐξιδρύω* could bear no other. But it strengthens the presumption which the form itself suggests, that this is the natural meaning of it.

³ Kuehner, *Greek Grammar*, § 567, 6, quoting Aesch. *Eum.* 696, Soph. *Trach.* 94 *καὶ γὰρ ὁσπερὶν τό γ' εὖ πράσσειν, ἐπεὶ πύθοιτο, κέρδος ἐμπολῆ, and other examples.*

precinct of the gods, set me down—and remove me or not, as we may be told—in the place where we are, whatever it is. It is our duty' &c.

113. σὺ μ' ἐξ ὁδοῦ πόδα
κρύψον κατ' ἄλσος.

Professor Jebb marks ἐξ ὁδοῦ πόδα as an error. In a careful note he shows, that neither (1) the σχῆμα καθ' ὅλον καὶ μέρος ('hide me,—that is my foot'), nor (2) the compound verb (κρύψον-πόδα με) is of any use here, both involving the assumption that κρύπτειν πόδα could mean 'to guide another's steps to a hiding-place'; and (3) that πόδα cannot be dismissed as 'redundant'. He mentions and properly disapproves the proposed emendations, regarding as 'probable' H. Keek's ἐκποδῶν ὁδοῦ, but this of course only as a counsel of despair. It is perhaps worth asking, whether ποῖς may not have been used, in colloquial phrases, as an equivalent for βάσις (*foot for foot-step*), and whether πόδα in that sense may not here be an accusative of *space*—'hide me in the grove a step off the road'. That this is what Oedipus means, and what is actually done, is shown, by his prompt re-appearance. Something near to such a use of ποῖς is implied by the phrase βαίνειν πόδα; for it is not easy to accept the explanation, that in this 'βαίνω is transitive'. Why should it admit a transitive use in this particular phrase, and not elsewhere? Neither is βαίνειν πόδα merely a synonym for βαίνειν: in the case cited by Professor Jebb, for instance, Eur. *El.* 1173,

ἀλλ' οἷδε μητρὸς νεοφόνους ἐν αἵμασιν
πεφυρμένοι βαίνουσιν ἐξ οἴκων πόδα,

in the word πόδα lies the whole force of the description. It belongs to πεφυρμένοι as much or more than to βαίνουσιν, the point being that the *feet* of the slayers are stained with the blood of their victim, and that as they *step* from the house they print a trace of their deed.

In *Alc.* 1153, ἀλλ' εὐτυχίης νόστιμον δ' ἔλθοις πόδα (where γρ.δόμον and γρ.καὶ ὁδὸν seem to be rather conjectures than various readings), it may be doubted whether πόδα refers to the 'foot' of the traveller at all, and not rather to the termination of his journey. The comparison of ^{his} journey out and the journey back to the two 'legs' (κῶλα) of the διάυλος (Aesch. *Ag.* 334, Eur. *Med.* 1181) may well have furnished colloquial language with the expression νόστιμος ποῖς for the arrival at home.

433.

οὐ δῆτ', ἐπεὶ τοι τὴν μὲν αὐτίχ' ἡμέραν
ὀπήνικ' ἔξει θυμὸς ᾗδιστον δέ μοι
τὸ καθθανεῖν ἦν καὶ τὸ λευσθῆναι πέτροις,
οὐδεὶς ἔρωτος τοῦδ' ἐφαίνετ' ὠφελῶν.
χρόνῳ δ' ὅτ' ἦδη πᾶς ὁ μόχθος ἦν πέπων,
κάμάνθανον τὸν θυμὸν ἐκδραμόντα μοι
μείζω κολαστὴν τῶν πρὶν ἡμαρτημένων,
τὸ τήνικ' ἦδη κ.τ.λ.

Two points may be noticed here :

(1) ἔρωτος τοῦδε—ἔρωτ' ἐς τόνδε Pappageorgius, Jebb. Here again the editor, who discusses the passage elaborately in the appendix, is singularly neat and decisive in cutting the roots of fallacious explanations. Such are (1) that ὠφελῶν is regarded as a substantive, *helper*, on the analogy of ἡ τεκοῦσά τινος and other such phrases '*expressing a familiar relationship*'. Where, he asks, do we find οὐδεὶς ἦν φίλων τοῦ ἀνδρὸς or the like? (2) that the passive ὠφελείσθαι τινος, *to benefit by a thing*, justifies the active: ὄνασθαι τινος is good; but ὀνάνημί τινά τινος? (3) that ὠφελῶν is ὠφέλημα παρέχων, on which principle, as he says, we might justify γραμματικῆς διδασκων for 'teaching grammar'. Neither is he to be put off with a genitive of 'respect' or 'connexion'. If these phrases will cover ὠφελῶν ἔρωτος, the genitive has no limits at all. The change which he accepts is very slight,¹ and in construction simple. It is open, however, to a slight objection, which applies also to the rejected explanations. The words ἔρωτ' ἐς τόνδε are superfluous and, unless an awkward emphasis is thrown on ἔρωτα, add nothing to the point, which is to contrast the conduct of the sons *at one time* with their conduct *at another*. Has it ever been considered whether ἔρωτος τοῦδε may be a genitive *absolute*, 'when this was my desire'? The words seem to be capable of this meaning, and it is effective as a resumption of the clause ὀπήνικ' . . . πέτροις. If ἔρωτος is a predicate the emphasis falls on it naturally.

(2) μείζω κολαστὴν: 'too great a chastiser', i.e. 'too severe', is the editor's explanation, relying on Eur. *Med.* 549, μέγας φίλος, 'a staunch friend'. But the support is untrustworthy, for μέγας φίλος there can perfectly well have its proper sense 'a powerful friend'; and the possibility of the other interpretation must be proved *aliunde*. The

¹ The assumed corruption is not, however, very natural: ἔρωτες might well be changed to ἔρωτος, 'and the change of τόνδε to τοῦδε would follow'. Why so? ἔρωτος τόνδε is not obviously inexplicable, for τόνδε might stand for με: and a corrector, if we suppose *deliberate* change, would have devised something easier than ἔρωτος τοῦδε.

meaning given by the editor here is no doubt correct in substance, but I submit that it is not *κολαστήν* which makes possible the use of *μέγας*, but *θυμόν*, and that to *θυμόν* in strict analysis *μείζω* belongs, being joined as a further predicate with *ἐκδραμόντα*. In fact the editor's translation 'that my wrath *had run too far* in punishing those past errors' seems to me precisely right, and more so than his note. The phrase *μέγας θυμός*, *high anger*, is familiar.

Space forbids me to go further at present in discussion: and it would be impossible even to sample here the notes which seem to dispose finally of their subject. I have noted for example as containing points of special interest, those *vv.* 342, 383, 420, 504, 522, 658, and many others. But it is useless to distinguish, where the whole deserves accurate study. I hope for an opportunity of returning to the subject.¹

A. W. VERRALL.

M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammatum Libri.
Mit erklärenden Anmerkungen von LUDWIG
FRIEDLÄNDER, Professor in Königsberg.
Leipzig, S. Hirzel. vol. i pp. (4) and 523,
vol. ii pp. 546. 18 M.

THIS book has long been impatiently expected. Prof. Friedländer's *Sittengeschichte* is itself a commentary on Martial and his times, and since Marquardt's death probably no one remains, unless it is Mommsen, equally familiar with the life and manners of the Roman empire.

English readers will read with interest the dedication 'dem Andenken an Hugh Andrew Johnstone Munro † 30 März 1885.' Since 1878 Munro and Friedländer had carried on a correspondence about Martial (i p. 125):

'Munro hat stets an meiner Arbeit den freundlichsten Antheil genommen und mir eine Reihe trefflicher

eigener Emendationen und auch einige interessante Conjekturen anderer Gelehrter in Cambridge mitgetheilt. Die Nachricht von seinem nach kurzer Krankheit in Rom am 30 März d. J. erfolgten Tode war für mich eine überaus schmerzliche.'

The introduction is divided into five chapters:

I (pp. 3-26). Martial's life and poems.

II (pp. 26-50). Martial's versification. (The chief part of this chapter, 'Elegisches Distichon,' is by Th. Birt, whose shortening of *o* in the substantive *modo*, x 16 8, calls forth a deserved protest from the *Revue Critique*.)

III (pp. 50-67). 'Chronology of Martial's Epigrams.' Here Friedländer has modified his earlier results by the aid of Stobbe, Mommsen, Hirschfeld, Asbach, Kerckhoff.

IV (pp. 67-119). 'Tradition of the Text,' with three appendices: (1) 'Derivation of the Three Families from Three Texts,' (2) 'On Cod. F and the MSS. identified with it by Schneidewin' (by C. Frobeen). (3) 'Orthographical Details' (by W. Gilbert). Many scholars have contributed collations, and Friedländer has worked hand in hand with Gilbert, whose edition of the text has just been published by Teubner, and whose review in the *Berliner Philolog. Wochenschr.* 4 Dec. 1886, enters into some detail about Friedländer's critical treatment of his materials. The orthography generally coincides with that sanctioned by the oldest MSS. of other authors; it is to be observed that both Friedländer and Gilbert write *epistola*, *brachium*.

V (pp. 120-127). 'Editions.' It is to be regretted that more use has not been made of Rader's commentary, which is often cited, for instance, by Becker in his *Gallus*. Marcellus and Heraldus are not even mentioned, though both of them did much to illustrate the language and the matter of their author. The names of masters in various departments of ancient learning, whom Prof. Friedländer has been able to consult on difficult points, Jordan, G. and O. Hirschfeld, P. Krüger, V. Hehn, F. Hultsch, C. F. W. Müller, A. Sallet, F. Schürer, suffice to assure us that nothing has been omitted to make Martial intelligible to this age. For the text, beside Gilbert and Munro, and collators, Baehrens, Buecheler, Grasberger, Rohde, have supplied contributions.

There are special introductions to *spect.* and XIV. The commentary is divided into four sections: (1) Critical notes (only where the reading is doubtful: it would be well to publish the entire variations of the important

¹ At v. 71 by a slip of the pen 'The Chorus are' is written for 'The Stranger is.' *A propos* of this, is not the *ΞΕΝΟΣ* of the traditional *dramatis personae* a singularly unhappy description? Oedipus addresses him of course by *ὁ ξένε*, but I can scarcely believe that Sophocles meant him to be so described. Could Antigone when she sees him approaching (v. 29) possibly have said *πέλας γὰρ ξένον τόνδε νῦν ὄρω* instead of *ἄνδρα*? Yet to describe him as *ξένος* in the *dramatis personae* is much the same thing. The word is essentially relative, and has no meaning as an independent description. *Ἄνθρωπος Κολωνιάτης* would be the proper phrase. Polynices at his approach (v. 1249) is described as *ὁ ξένος*, but naturally, as he is known to be such, *ἐμπόλιον οὐκ ὄντα, συγγενῇ δέ*, v. 1156.

MSS. collated for the first time). (2) Dr. E. Wagner's parallels from earlier and later writers. (3) Citations in grammarians, scholiasts and mediaeval writers. (4) Explanatory notes.

At the end is an index of names by Carl Froben (pp. 347-381), divided into mythological, geographical and topographical, authors, historical persons before the battle of Actium, Roman emperors, real (in *italics*) and fictitious names of the imperial times, names of animals. A full index of words (pp. 382-532) and an index to the introduction and notes complete the book. The index of words is an improvement on the Delphin index, for under the adjectives the substantives with which they agree are given. But it does not supersede Lemaire's index of phrases; both are necessary to the student. By referring to his *Sittengeschichte*, to Becker-Göll's *Gallus*, to Marquardt's and Mommsen's handbooks and other standard authorities, Friedländer has been able to compress much valuable teaching in a small compass. I hope elsewhere to furnish larger materials for the interpretation of the prince of epigrammatists. Here space will allow only a few extracts from my collections.

III 18

perfixisse tuas questa est praefatio fauces.
cum te excusaris, Maxime, quid recitas?

Suet. Nero 41 *edictis tandem Vindictis contumeliosis et frequentibus pernotus, senatum epistula in ultionem sui reique publicae ahortatus est, excusato languore faucium propter quem non adesset*. Quintil. iv 1 § 8. Tac. d. 20 pr. *quis nunc feret oratorem de infirmitate valetudinis praefantem? quæstia sunt ferme principia Corvini*. Gellius xi 9 § 1.

III 23

omnia cum retro pueris opsonia tradas,
cur non mensa tibi ponitur a pedibus?

Sen. ep. 77 § 8 *non esse inhumanum, quemadmodum cena peracta reliquiae circumstantibus dividantur, sic peracta vita aliquid porrigi his, qui totius vitae ministri fuissent*. Petron. 67 '*Narra mihi, Gai, oro, Fortunata quare non recumbit?*' '*Quomodo nosti?*' inquit '*illam*,' Trimalchio, '*nisi argentum composuerit, nisi reliquias pueris dividerit, aquam in os suum non coniciet*.' Suet. Galba 22 *cibi plurimi traditur, quem tempore hiberno etiam ante lucem capere consuevit, inter cenam vero usque eo abundantis, ut congestas super manus reliquias circumferri*

iuberet spargique ad pedes stantibus. cf. Phaedrus i 22 6.

III 75 3 bulbique salaces. Athen. ii 64 and 65 p. 63^d seq. who cites the proverb οὐδέν σ' ὀνήσει βολβὸς ἂν μὴ νεῦρ' ἔχῃς. Apic. vii 12.

IV 86 9 10

si damnaverit, ad salariorum
curras scriinia protinus licebit.

From Catullus 14 17 18 *nam si luxerit, ad librarium curram scriinia*.

IV 89 1 ohe iam satis est, ohe, libelle. See on the change of quantity Munro on Lucretius iv 1259 and Nicander, frag. 70 14 ἴσον ἴσῳ.

V 69 7 8

quid prosunt sacrae pretiosa silentia linguae?
incipient omnes pro Cicerone loqui.

From Sextilius Ena in Sen. suas. 6 § 27 *deslendus Cicero est Latiaeque silentia linguae*.

VIII 30 6

totis pascitur illa sacris. This is said of the right hand of the convict who represented Scaevola, thrusting his hand into the fires of the altar. Friedländer conjectures *sacris p. i. focus*: '*totis* was written *focus*, and then the transposition was made for the metre.' Duff and Munro explain *totis* adverbially '*dextra unice pascitur et delectatur sacrificiis*.' I take it in its strict sense: the hand does not timidly skirt the fringe of the fire, letting 'I dare not' wait upon 'I would,' but plunges into the thick of it and there roams, devouring the devouring element, like a beast in its pasture; '*feeds on the length and breadth of the burnt-offering*.' *Sacris focus* is very tame in comparison.

VIII 76 7 *vero verius ergo quid sit, audi*. cf. vi 30 6 *vis dicam tibi veriora veris?*

Sen. ep. 66 § 8 *nihil invenies rectius recto, non magis quam verius vero, quam temperato temperatius*. Paulin. vit. Amb. 25 *certo certius*. Arnob. ii 48 *omni vero verissimum est certoque certissimum* (on the abl. after superl. see Bernays *Ges. Abh.* ii 128).

IX 87 4 5

et dicis 'modo liberum esse iussi
Nastam.'

Flor. i 10 § 8 *valere liberosque esse iussit*. Manumission *per epistulam*, cod. vii 6 1 § 1c.

X 33 4

quae sulphurato nolit empta ramento
Vatiniorum proxeneta fractorum.

Sen. n.q. i 1 § 8 *nam apud nos quoque ramenta sulphure aspersa ignem ex intervallo trahunt*.

X 25 5 6

nam cum dicatur tunica praesente molesta
'ure manum' plus est dicere 'non facio.'

The use of the present deserves to be illustrated.

Plaut. trin. 1059 CH. *heus tu, asta ilico. audi, heus tu.* ST. non sto.—most. 251 (= 261 R) PU. *tum tu igitur cedo purpurissum.* SC. non do. 862-3 *velut ubi advorsum ut eant ero suo vocantur:* | 'non eo: molestus ne sis.'—CURC. 621 PHAEDR. *ambula in ius.* THER. non eo. 662 PHAEDR. *tace tu.* CURC. non taceo. 712-3 CAPP. *non taces?* THER. non taceo.—Ter. haut. 610-1 CH. *pro Menedemo nunc tibi ego respondeo* | 'non emo.'—Sen. contr. 27 § 14 'caede' inquit: 'non caedo.' *verbera:* 'non ferio.'—Passio Perpetuae et Felicitatis 2 'fac sacrum pro salute imperatorum.' et ego respondi: 'non facio.'—Cypriani acta proconsul. 3 (in Hartel's Cypr. p. exii. = Aug. serm. 309) *Galerius Maximus proconsul dixit: 'iusserunt te sacratissimi imperatores caeremoniari.'* Cyprianus episcopus dixit: 'non facio.' cf. Cypr. p. 483 17 = 660 19. Acta Felicis c. 2 § 2 (in Dupin's Optatus, 149 col. 2) *Magnilianus curator dixit: 'Felix episcopo, da libros vel membranas quascumque habes.'* Felix episcopus dixit: *habeo, sed non do* (same reply *ibid.* c. 5 p. 150 col. 2). Ruinart acta sincera (Pionius c. 21, but in c. 8 the future is used). acta sanct. Feb. 1 p. 46^d. Le Blant, Les Actes des Martyrs p. 81.

XIV 151 dulci sed pondere venter
 si tumeat.

Ov. her. 11 37 *iamque tumescebant vitiati pondera ventris.* Rittershusius and others on Phaedrus III 15. *lexx. s.v. pondus.*

XIV 174 2 *cetera matris habet.*

Cf. ii 89 4 *hoc Ciceronis habes.* *ibid.* 2 and 6.

XIV 212
si solum species hominis caput, Hectors credas:

si stantem videas, Astyanacta putes.

Iuv. vi 503-4 *Andromachen a fronte videbis.* | post minor est, credas aliam.

XIV 217 1 *dic quotus et quanti cupias cenare.* See Obbarius on Hor. ep. 1 5 30 *tu, quotus esse velis, rescribe.*

XIV 218
non tantum calamis, sed cantu fallitur ales,
callida dum tacita crescit harundo manu.

On the fowler's lined rod see Zacher in Hermes xix 432-436 with the supplement of O. Crusius *ibid.* xxi 487-490. Most of

my collections have been anticipated by one or other of these papers, but I believe that no one has called attention to a graphic description in Aug. de magistro c. 10 § 32 *nam quaero abs te, si quisquam ignarus deceptionis avium, quae calamis et visco affectatur, obviam fieret aucupi, armis quidem suis instructo, non tamen aucupanti, sed iter agenti; quo viso premeret gradum secumque, ut fit, admirans cogitaret et quaereret quidnam sibi hominis ille vellet ornatus; auceps autem cum in se videret attentum, ostentandi se studio cannas expediret et prope animadversam aliquam aviculam fistula et accipitre figeret, subigeret et caperet; nonne illum spectatorem suum doceret nullo significatu, sed re ipsa, quod ille scire cupiebat?*

In a word: this edition is indispensable for all students of Martial, containing a greatly enlarged and sifted critical apparatus, a concise antiquarian commentary, such as probably no other living man could have given us, a large collection of parallel passages, and occasionally valuable grammatical and lexicographical notes. There is still room for a young Ruhnken or Heindorf to labour in this last field, and the commentators on Horace (esp. Obbarius), Apuleius, Petronius, with Casaubon's Persius and Suetonius, will supply abundant materials and models of research.

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

The Development of the Athenian Democracy.
By F. B. JEVONS, M.A., Tutor in the University of Durham.

THIS pamphlet is an attempt to elucidate some of the obscurities of early Athenian history, and to explain, on the basis of historical development, how political power passed from the Eupatridae into the hands of the *πληθος*.

Mr. Jevons attacks his subject with two different weapons. The first of these is the recently discovered papyrus-fragment of Aristotle's *πολιτεία Ἀθηναίων*: the second is the close application of the 'comparative method,' in order to investigate the interdependence of ancient religious and political systems. Mr. Jevons is surely mistaken in thinking (p. 27) that he is the first to apply this method to Athenian political development. Not to mention Freeman's *Lectures on Comparative Politics*, La Cité Antique of Fustel de Coulanges is entirely based on this idea.

It is well known that in 683 B.C. a step in the direction of democracy was made by the institution of nine annual archons. The

competition for the office, then practically the sole depositary of power, was very keen. It appears from the papyrus that in the archonship of a certain Damasias, whose date Mr. Jevons, following Bergk¹ (*Rhein. Mus.* 1881, p. 87 ff.), places at 639–8 B.C., an outbreak of violence occurred which resulted in the division of the archonate between the three 'classes' in such a way that the Eupatridae were represented by four archons, the Geomori (Georgi, Apoiki) by three, and the Demiurgi by two. Here a difficulty at once arises, because the historians tell us that it was not till half a century after B.C. 639 that Solon instituted his property classification, admitting only the first class to office. This would be, if anything, a retrograde step, since obviously fewer Geomori and Demiurgi than before would be eligible to office. Mr. Jevons shows that the view that only the πεντακοσιομέδιμοι were eligible to office under Solon rests solely on a passage of Plutarch (*Aristides* i.), on other grounds suspicious, and concludes, with the support of Aristotle (*Pol.* ii. 12), that by the constitution of Solon all ἀρχαὶ were held by the first three property classes. It may be added that the negative evidence of Pollux viii. 131 (οἱ δὲ τὸ θηρικὸν τελούντες οὐδεμίαν ἀρχὴν ἤρχον) and of Harpocration s.v. θήτες (οὔτοι δὲ οὐδεμίαν ἤρχον ἀρχήν) tell in the same direction.

Then follows an ingenious piece of reasoning, which contains the gist of the paper. Proceeding on the assumption (previously laid down by Oncken, *Staatslehre des Aristoteles*) that when Aristotle speaks in abstract terms about the development of political institutions he is really referring to those of Athens, the author argues that Aristotle's well-known Four Stages of the evolution of democracy (*Pol.* vi. (iv.) 4–6) do in fact exactly correspond to what actually occurred in the history of Athens. The First Stage, in which the depositary of power is τὸ γεωργικὸν καὶ τὸ κερτμήμων μετρίαν οὐσίαν, corresponds to the pre-Solonian period. The Second Stage, when the suffrage without restriction belongs to all ἀντιπύθνοιο κατὰ τὸ γένος, answers to the Reforms of Solon. The Third Stage, τὸ πᾶσιν ἐξείναι ὅσοι ἂν ἐλεύθεροι ᾖσι, reflects the Reforms of Cleisthenes, under whom the term ἐλεύθεροι assumed a new and wider meaning. The Fourth Stage, when voters are paid by the State for their services, τοὺς ἀπόρους λαμβάνειν μισ-

θὸν, admittedly stands for the Periclean Reforms.

Mr. Jevons bases his arguments on the cardinal fact that admission to the φρατρία meant possession of the franchise. The πλῆθος at Athens, like its analogue, the plebs at Rome, wanted power, and was determined to make itself unpleasant until it obtained it. Now power, i.e. the right of choosing your rulers and holding them to account, was only held by members of the φρατρία, which φρατρία were made up of a certain number of γένη. Belong to a γένος the πλῆθος could not, any more than the plebs at Rome could be admitted to a patrician's household rites. The problem could only be solved, as indeed it was solved at Rome, by admitting the πλῆθος into the φρατρία but not into the γένη of which the φρατρία were composed. This revolution was accomplished before Solon, possibly soon after what was practically the monarchy was subdivided, just as at Rome the plebs forced their way into the *Comitia Centuriata* soon after the bisection of the regal power. But, in order not to make a complete surrender, the Eupatridae probably accompanied their concession to the πλῆθος with a timocratic restriction of the franchise, such as is described by Aristotle in his First Stage, and this was in force when Solon instituted his reforms. Solon extended the franchise to all members of φρατρία, without any restrictions of property, but, in order to check indiscriminate admission, he denied the right of inheritance in intestacy (ἀγχοστία), and therefore the franchise, to νόθοι, i.e. to children of non-Athenians by either parent.

Cleisthenes introduced manhood suffrage for Attica. The φρατρία, as a division carrying political privileges, was abolished, and a geographical subdivision of Attica into δήμοι substituted, the right of πολιτεία being henceforth dependent on registration as δημότης not as φράτωρ. This was manhood suffrage, with one restriction, that the father must be an Athenian. No proof is at hand that Cleisthenes was the author of this law, but it is obvious that some check must have been introduced, and Mr. Jevons points out that if the πολιτεία still had to be γνήσιος ἐξ ἀμφότεν, Cimon, Themistocles, and Thucydides (Ὀλορι), all νόθοι ε *peregrinis*, would have been ἀτιμοι.

The φρατρία, killed by Cleisthenes, was revived by Pericles. This was the effect of the law μόνους Ἀθηναίους εἶναι τοὺς ἐκ δυνεὶν Ἀθηναίου γεγονότας (*Plut. Per.* 37), a law rendered a State necessity by Pericles' new

¹ Mr. Jevons makes too little use of this admirable paper. He takes his readings of the papyrus from the completely superseded interpretation of Blass, *Hermes*, 1880, p. 336 f.; 1881, p. 42 f.

arrangement for giving pay for attendance at the ἐκκλησία. This new arrangement, dangerous to finance if open to any casual applicant, had the double effect of restoring the φπαρία as a political qualification, and of drawing together in a closer bond of union all true-born Athenians.

The weak link in this chain of practically rewritten history appears to be the period of the Solonian and pre-Solonian Reforms. According to Mr. Jevons Solon abolished the property qualification for the exercise of the franchise. This involves two assumptions: (1) that when, in 639, the archonate was divided amongst the three classes, the franchise depended on a property qualification, and (2) that, granted a property qualification to the franchise was made, it lasted up to Solon's time. Neither assumption rests on a shadow of evidence. Gilbert indeed (*Griech. Staatsalt.* i. 123), whom Mr. Jevons is perhaps following, suggests that the concession of 639 meant 'ein wohl mit einer vermögensrechtlichen Beschränkung verbundenes Wahlrecht,' but he advances no proof of the assumption, nor does Mr. Jevons, except the comparison of what happened at Rome. Again, the words of the papyrus-fragment itself, immediately following the account of the breaking up of the archonate, seem to show that the arrangement was purely temporary. It continues καὶ οὗτοι τὸν μετὰ Δαμοσίαν ἦρ[ξαν ἐν]αντὶν, which surely implies that the change terminated with that year. It was a change hastily made, to meet the demands of tumult, and as hastily revoked. And it is clear that it is quite unnecessary to assume any elaborate timocratic restriction of the franchise if the right to exercise it only lasted one year. Besides, this breaking up of the archonate was a reform of an ultra-democratic character, too democratic for its early date. It was the institution of plebeian magistrates. And if it lasted from 639 to 594, it seems impossible that we should not have heard more of it, either by direct historical record, or by the indirect evidence of democratic reforms carried during those forty-five years. The five Georgic and Demiurgic archons must have made a very bad use of their time if they failed to carry against their four Eupatrid brethren nothing more than the legal reforms of Draco. Nor is it easy to see how the author of (Arist.) *Pol.* ii. 8, could have called such a constitution ἀριστοκρατία λίαν ἄκατος.

One or two minor points remain which seem open to criticism. It is stated (p. 23) that 'in B.C. 411 the total number of citizens

[cf Athens] probably did not amount to more than the 5,000 citizens to whom the ἐκκλησία was limited.' Then what was the point of the Four Hundred limiting the citizenship to five thousand? They obviously intended to re-impose some timocratic qualification (Thuc. viii. 65, end), to the exclusion of the poorer classes. The reason given (on p. 24) for the conclusion of the Thirty Years' Truce by Athens (that it was to gain time for preparation for the inevitable war with Sparta) looks like a piece of rather loose writing, and sounds much as though it had been said that in 1871 the French made peace in order to prepare for the inevitable war with Germany. Is it not rather 'hard luck,' too, to say (p. 27) that the whole of Curtius' account of the Cleisthenean reforms is 'vitiating by a fundamental error' because he, amongst other mistakes, was not acquainted with a fact recorded only in the Berlin papyrus, which was not discovered till more than twenty years after Curtius wrote his *History*? The quotation from Herodotus vii. 2, is rather a slender peg on which to hang the 'primacy of the eldest son' among the Greeks, for that passage plainly refers, not to the headship of a family, but succession to a throne, by no means the same thing. Finally, the word φπαρία is regarded (p. 31) as 'a later form of παρία, which is an Ionic weakening of παρία a by-form of πάτρα: thus φπαρία is the association of sons of a common father.' Would not the received connexion of φπαρία with Sans. *bhrātā*, Lat. *frater*, have been a simpler way of arriving at the same result? Curtius (*Gk. Etym.* 699) deals with the form παρία.

On the whole, however, although we are not prepared to accept in its entirety this complete remodelling (for it is nothing less) of much of the early Attic history, yet the author deserves the gratitude of all students of comparative politics for his bold and lucid attempt, from which no one could fail to derive instruction, to grapple with a most difficult and perplexing problem.

A. H. COOKE.

Römische Geschichte. Von THEODOR MOMMSEN.
Fünfter Band. Die Provinzen von Caesar bis Diocletian. Berlin. Weidmann. 1885. 9 M.

It is thirty years since Dr. Mommsen published the third volume of his *Roman History*. He has at last given us out of its proper order vol. v. The reason for the delay and the change of order hang together. The interval has been largely occupied with

the editing of the *Corpus Inscr. Lat.*, and the present volume is the first-fruits for general readers of that laborious but fruitful task. Without it no such clear and definite account of the provinces could have been produced, and even with its help there is probably no one else who unites sufficient detailed knowledge of the provinces with a mastery of the imperial history as a whole, to have guided us through evidence so intricate into so clear a view of the subject. A chronological history of the Provincial governments indeed we must not look for here, nor do the available authorities suffice for such a work. The historians of the Empire rarely rose above the level of court-chroniclers; above all they never realised how the living development of the Empire was shifting from the centre to the circumference. Their allusions therefore to the provinces are scattered and fragmentary, and even such writers as Strabo or the elder Pliny do not as a rule give us exactly the information that we most want. Still some sort of picture, though vague and blurred at the best, may be drawn of the Empire from the collective testimony of the classical writers. We get from them an impression, if no more, that the provinces during the first two centuries were on the whole flourishing, some of them indeed as they have never been either before or since, that their administration was efficient and continuous, and their Romanisation in many cases complete. But it is only by collecting scattered notices and allusions, as well from the 'Texts' as from the often more valuable evidence of inscriptions, coins, and archaeology, that we are enabled, and that incompletely, to fill up this picture, to verify this impression, and to trace the steps and stages of the development of the Empire. This then is Dr. Mommsen's aim. The work of the first three centuries was the ingathering of foreign elements into the Graeco-Roman civilisation. The necessary condition for this was the 'pax Romana,' which again was dependent on the frontier defences of the Empire. The volume therefore naturally falls into two main divisions. Chapters i., iv., v., vi. and ix. give a chronological account of the frontier policy along the great barriers of the Rhine, Danube, and Euphrates, and the relations with barbarian tribes which shaped or resulted from that policy. The other chapters deal rather with the inner development in civilisation, commerce, administration, and literature, which was going on meanwhile behind the iron barriers of the legionary camps.

The foundation of the frontier policy in the West as laid down by Augustus is

described in chapter i. Italy received for the first time a definite boundary, being protected from barbarian tribes and separated from the great military commands by a girdle of small procuratorial provinces reaching from the Maritime Alps to Noricum. Through these provinces ran the great military roads which connected Italy both with Gaul and the armies of the Rhine, but they were not themselves garrisoned with legionary troops till the time of Marcus Aurelius. Towards the Danube the vaguely-bounded and loosely-administered Illyricum was replaced by three military provinces, Pannonia, Dalmatia, and Moesia, and the great river, from Carnuntum to its mouth, became the political, though not at once the military, boundary of the Empire. On the Rhine the policy of Augustus was less bold, perhaps, as Dr. Mommsen inclines to think, less really prudent. At least, it was influenced more by internal and financial considerations than by military and imperial interests. For years the country up to the Elbe had practically been occupied by Roman legions, and even Roman law and administration were being introduced, when the whole policy of the Empire, superintended as it had been for nearly twenty years by members of the imperial family, was altered apparently in consequence of a single military disaster. In a sense no doubt this step was 'a turning-point in the fate of nations,' but its effects were hardly felt for the first two centuries. Indeed the forward policy was to a certain extent renewed in Upper Germany by Domitian and Trajan, a proceeding on which further light may be thrown when some German 'Bruce' makes the German *limes* tell its tale. The chapter on the Danubian provinces is perhaps the most interesting in the book. This was the critical point of the Empire, and as the German armies after the first century were diminished, so those of the Danube were continually being increased. It was here that the Augustan policy was for the first time modified by Trajan's annexation of Dacia, here too that Marcus Aurelius, had he lived, would have supported this outlying province by Marcomannia, in place of the shattered *regnum Vannianum*, and Sarmatia in the valley of the Theiss. Whether this policy would have saved the Empire from the Gothic wars is perhaps a vain speculation: at least, when the Illyrian emperors replaced anarchy by order, it was proved that the 'Roman state could still only be broken by itself.'

On the eastern frontier Rome, since the

time of Pompey, was face to face with a great power, and here, more than on the other frontiers, the policy of buffer-states was pursued. Of these the most important was Great Armenia, and Dr. Mommsen points out more clearly than has ever been done before how the relations of Rome with Parthia hinged on Armenian affairs. There were three possible courses to adopt, to annex it to the Empire, to relinquish it to Parthia, or to make it a client state. Augustus, too cautious for the first, too mindful of Roman prestige for the second, adopted the middle course. The result was continual friction, and more than once actual war with Parthia. Nero's government, considering perhaps that prestige was sufficiently saved by Corbulo's campaigns, adopted the second, insisting only on a nominal suzerainty for Rome. Trajan characteristically took the bolder course, and not only annexed Armenia, but by extending the frontier to the Tigris, brought it completely within the Empire. This, in spite of Hadrian's withdrawal and occasional disaster, remained the Roman policy henceforward, and on the whole was justified by its results.

Of the more complex contents of the other chapters it is possible in a short notice to glance at one or two points only. Of special interest is the treatment of the various forms assumed by the municipal constitutions established in the various parts of the Empire. Gaul with its large tribal communities still existing, but centering round their principal town or *civitas*, Spain with a separate town-constitution for each small canton, Africa with its towns of Punic constitution, Asia and Syria with their Macedonian creations, retaining still their Hellenic government, Greece with its numerous gradations of civic autonomy, helpless before a stroke of the proconsul's pen, and lastly, the *coloniae* and *municipia* gradually scattered over the whole Empire—all form a striking example of unity of administration amid diversity of detail. The various native languages again received as a rule similar treatment from the government, though local circumstances gave them different histories. Thus, while all were restricted to private intercourse, the Thracian disappeared, the Celtic, Iberian and Illyrian retreated to mountainous corners, the Berber and Egyptian remained in general use outside the towns, while to the Aramaic even a literary importance was attached, as being the vehicle of Christian propaganda.

Very happy and suggestive are Dr. Mommsen's remarks on the literary activity

of the provinces. Gaul, 'the land of learning and teaching,' is the producer of panegyric, *vers de société*, and at last of pious hymns. Asia Minor is the home of the Sophists sent out over all the Empire like lamps all of one pattern. Syria produces epigrams, feuilletons and romances. Africa, once the '*nutricula caesidicorum*,' at last becomes the seat of Church literature, while Spain alone entered thoroughly into the development of Italian literature. Curious too is the literary activity of Berytus, 'the Latin island in the sea of Oriental Hellenism,' while the little towns in Galatia were attracted to philosophy as the needle to the magnet, and Bithynia in the second century produced some of the best literary work of the Empire. On the commercial policy of Augustus and his successors the chapter on Egypt gives us fresh and valuable information. The expedition of Aelius Gallus was caused by the Arabian competition in the Oriental trade. The abortive mission of C. Caesar to the East was partly to have repeated the same attempt, while Nero's Oriental schemes and Trajan's Arabian policy looked also partly towards commercial ends. The relations of Rome with the Homeritae of Arabia Felix and the Axomitae of Abyssinia are a comparatively unknown, but not unimportant, chapter in its commercial history, on which Dr. Mommsen throws considerable light. It is to be regretted that both in this chapter and more or less throughout the volume, the references to authorities, whether 'texts,' inscriptions, or coins, are so comparatively rare. The value of the book to students would have been immensely increased if they had been enabled to verify and test many of Dr. Mommsen's statements for themselves.

E. G. HARDY.

Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der Indogermanischen Sprachen. Kurzgefasste Darstellung der Geschichte des Altindischen, Altiranischen (Avestischen u. Altpersischen), Altarmenischen, Altgriechischen, Lateinischen, Umbrisch-Samnitischen, Altirischen, Gotischen, Althochdeutschen, Litauischen u. Altkirchenslawischen. Von KARL BRUGMANN, ord. Professor der vergl. Sprachwissenschaft in Freiburg-i.-B. Erster Band. Einleitung u. Lautlehre. Strassburg. Trübner. 1886. 14 M.

At last we have the first instalment of a complete official statement of the new Indo-European grammar. The main principles of

the neo-grammarians (junggrammatiker) may be taken as proved, and the time has come for an authoritative manual. To those who still remain unconvinced that phonetic laws have no exceptions, that reconstruction by analogy is many times more common than direct transmission, that Indo-European vowels were very much like Greek vowels and very little like Sanskrit vowels,—to such sceptics this book has no proofs to offer; the proofs have come in the previous writings which Dr. Brugmann enumerates in his long list of 'literature.' But the book is itself a proof, of those who have any feeling for the *analogia fidei*. I cannot understand how any unbeliever can read it and fail to come out an adherent. A coherent and detailed system, following up all the facts and providing for them within its own limits, must be true so far as it goes. It may be re-interpreted, enlarged, subsumed, even inverted; but it can never be abolished.

It is well to emphasize that the new grammar is not a contradiction but a development of the old 'comparative grammar.' When Georg Curtius talked about 'sporadic variations,' he did not really mean that they were uncaused; he only meant that the causes were undiscoverable. And when we talk about 'phonetic laws with no exceptions,' we do not mean that we have discovered all the phonetic laws and all the cases where their products have disappeared, but only that we have faith that they would be discovered in an ideal system. It is one thing to say that 'original *gh* appears in Latin sometimes as *h*, sometimes as *g*,' and another to say that 'original *gh* appears in Latin as *h* between two vowels (*veho*) and *g* after a nasal (*finco*). If after that we are confronted with *figura*, we call it not 'an exception,' but 'a reconstruction for an earlier **fikura*, on the analogy of *finco*.' And if we cannot similarly unravel the history of the 'velar' *gh*, or *g'h* (why does *ng'h* appear as *ngu* in *ninguit*, but as *v* in *levis* ?), we have faith that something has happened below the surface; either the phonetic law is more subtle than we know, or an analogical product has extruded the strictly phonetic word. The scoffer might say that this is only a difference of terminology; and in one sense it is; but it is the difference between the terminology which acquiesces in ignorance and the terminology which strives after knowledge. This is the justification of the 'pedantry' and 'unpractical doctrinairism' of the new method. It is found in practice that the way to get new knowledge is to have precise, hard-and-

fast theories, and when the facts will not agree with them, to add new developments and riders till the facts are taken in. If the Ptolemaic astronomy had been content with a genial latitude of statement, it would have remained Ptolemaic to the end of time. But it insisted on a fresh epicycle for every irregularity, and its reward was the Copernican system. The same thing is true of every science. People begin with rough statements, from these they go on to precise statements, and then make great transforming discoveries. Of course it is easier to be wrong in precise statements than in rough statements; where you only profess to know one fact there is only room for one mistake, but where you profess to know ten facts there is room for ten mistakes. And even when we are right, it is harder to carry conviction in comparative philology than in other sciences, because the matter is so delicate and so fleeting.

This first volume is an account of the 'phonetic laws' only. That is, it gives a list of the Indo-European sounds as far as we know them, and an account of the form which they have taken, under all circumstances for which laws have been ascertained, in the oldest language (or pair of languages) of each group. It is this, and nothing else. Schleicher used to strike the English reader as wanting in 'general information,' but there is much less in Dr. Brugmann. His introduction of nineteen pages is chiefly taken up with the definition of the languages in question; he just refers to the 'Asia or Europe' controversy, without expressing an opinion. He does, however, commit himself in favour of the agglutinative theory of inflexions, with no mention of any other view (p. 14). 'What we put together under the heads of word-formation and flexion arose by composition, that is, by the following process: a group of words which formed a syntactical complex was fused into a unity, in which the whole was in some way isolated as against its elements. This word-fusion from the beginning onwards completed itself in the same way, as afterwards, in the age of separate languages (partly even in historical times) the final members of compounds became suffixes.' And then he gives the instances of Indo-European *ge*, Latin *mente*, German *heit*, Irish *mór*, becoming mere suffixes in Gothic *mik*, French *fièrement*, German *Schönheit*, Irish *buadhmar*. But he gives up the attempt to discover the origin of the Indo-European suffixes, only allowing that some verb-inflexions may contain pronouns.

Quite rightly, Dr. Brugmann avoids the attempt to convert historical grammar into phonetic physiology. There are two pages on the distinctions between 'voiced and voiceless,' 'sonorous and noised' (Sonorlaute und Geräuschlaute), 'sonant and consonant'; and a line or two at the head of each class of sounds, and a few remarks in the section on accents, and that is all. The object of comparative grammar is historical, not physiological; given certain languages, which are interesting on literary and historical grounds, to reconstruct their past history and common origin, for the sake of adding to our knowledge of the peoples who spoke them. All that physiology can do for us is to picture to us the facts which we establish from our documents; but physiology can never give us our linguistic facts; and conversely, when we have our linguistic facts, we can state them without physiology. If we could not trace the physiological process by which *ns* became the Umbrian *f*, the fact would be just as certain, and the resulting etymologies would be just as valid. Where physiology comes in, is in recalling us to real life. In dealing with dead languages, we are all in danger of becoming paper etymologists; and if we do not check our processes by actual phonetic reproduction, we shall come back to the 'vowels that counted for nothing and the consonants that counted for very little.' Even the Indo-Europeans were human beings, and they must have talked like human beings. But this physiological groundwork is not part of the matter of our comparative grammar; it is one of the natural causes by which our matter is conditioned. There is every reason to study the physiology of speech, but no reason to put it into a book about any given set of languages.

Of course, we have not yet attained finality or unanimity. There are many points on which it is possible to disagree with Dr. Brugmann. In particular, his general theory of vowel-gradation is a little inconsistent. He professes, very wisely, to enumerate the different kinds of vowel-gradation which are actually found, and to take a quite agnostic line about their morphological parallelism with each other. He gives them as

1 *e*-series 0, a, o, ē, ō (πα-τρ-ός, πα-τέρ-α, φρά-τορ-α, πα-τήρ, φρά-τωρ)

2 *e*-series 0, a, ē, ō (da-dh-más, hi-tás, τί-θη-μι, θω-μός)

3 *a*-series 0, a, ā, ō (ta-sth-úsī, sthī-tás, stā-men, φωνή)

4 *o*-series 0, o, ō (da-d-más, δά-ρος, δέ-δω-μι)

5 *a*-series 0, a (o?), ā, ō (j-mán-, ἄγ-ω, στρατ-ἄγ-ός)

6 *o*-series 0, o, ō (0 doubtful, ὀδμή, ἐνώδης);

where *a* is a 'neutral vowel' inferred from a Sanskrit *i*, corresponding to a Greek *ε*, *ο*, or *α*, and 0 is the stage in which the vowel vanishes altogether. Then he goes on (pp. 248, 249): 'We distinguish six gradation-series (Ablautsreihen). . . . Attempts have been made by many . . . to systematise these series morphologically, that is, to put together those phases out of the different series which correspond to a given morphological category, e.g. to the root-syllable in the participle formed with -to-, or in the indicative formed with the so-called thematic vowel. . . . The investigations instituted in this direction have not yet gone far enough to let us give a system of gradation-series completely worked out on this principle. And it is questionable whether we have a right to aim at the attainment of such a system at all, in the sense in which it is usual to do so. Several strata of formations, distinct in their time of origin, seem to overlies each other. In those which arose earlier, much may have been obliterated by transference of forms before the new cause of gradation came into activity; and the later phonetic law which called new distinctions into being did not act in the same way as the older law or laws. In this case it is from the outset impossible to expect that parallels can be found everywhere.' (Italics are the spaced type of the original.)

This is reasonable. But, in practice, Dr. Brugmann commits himself (pp. 257, 259) to Dr. Hübschmann's view that *a* is a 'weak-stage' vowel in *bhames* and *si-stames*, but a 'first-high-stage' vowel in *agō* and *aidhō*, so that *bhā-mi bhames* is like *ei-mi i-mes*, and *aidhō idhros* show an exactly parallel gradation. This may be so, but in a professedly non-committed treatise it is decidedly taking a side to omit all mention of M. de Saussure's view that gradation is always epsilon-gradation (substituting *e* and *o* for his *a*₁ and *a*₂). M. de Saussure would say (with the above substitution) that *idh* and *aidh* are phonetic variations of the same weak stage, and that the two high stages are *eaidh* and *oidh*, just as the high stages of *bha* are *bhea* and *bhoa* (φαπὲν, φᾶμι, φωνή). This is at least possible. As to *jmán-* and its compounds,

which are adduced to prove that $g : ag :: s : es$, the demoralized vowel-system of Sanskrit can never prove that a vowel was left out in Indo-European. But I am not here defending the universal epsilon; I only insist that Dr. Brugmann should have mentioned it. On two other vowel-groups Dr. Brugmann has taken the view which appears to me to be against all the evidence. I cannot understand how he can give up the precise testimony of Greek and Latin to the root-vowels of $\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon\mu\epsilon\nu$ and $\acute{\alpha}\phi\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$, $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$ and $\pi\omicron\rho\acute{o}\nu$, in favour of the colourless residuum of Sanskrit. I should explain $dadh\acute{m}as$ and $h\acute{u}l\acute{a}s$ and their like, on the simple principle that the Indians found a constantly disappearing in places where it represented e , and so they got into a habit of leaving out a wherever it came; but in some of these cases they re-inserted i as a connecting vowel. This must be the history of $p\acute{it}\acute{a}$, because no European language shews any trace of any vowel but a in the first syllable; in $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ — $satus$ and $\delta\omicron\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ — $datus$, we have before our eyes Indo-European vowels intermediate in pronunciation between e and a , o and a , which should be added, as M. de Saussure has added them, to the Indo-European alphabet. Dr. Brugmann's ϵ is a very good vowel in its place, where it comes between a root and a suffix ($\mu\epsilon\nu\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$, *genitus*); but it should be kept to its place.

Many parts of the book cannot be judged until it is finished. On the treatment of i (the i -consonant which English books call y or j), for instance, Dr. Brugmann's statements have no claim to completeness until he has accounted for the δ and ζ which he will not accept as phonetic successors of i . On p. 202 (note) he suggests that the $a\delta$ -stems may be t -stems in disguise, but only as an *obiter dictum*. The δ -stems remain, and the $\delta\omega$ -stems, and the verbs in $-\zeta\omega$. In the next volume he must give an account of their formation independent of i . Till then, the 'parasitic dental' must hold its ground, as a possible explanation, for which future knowledge may supply the distinctive phonetic conditions. In the same way, all that is said (pp. 256, 463) about the shortening of the first element of the original $\bar{o}i$, $\bar{e}u$, and similar groups, before a consonant, may be true, but it depends on the treatment of formations like $\acute{\epsilon}\psi\epsilon\nu\sigma\alpha$, $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$, $\nu\eta\eta\varsigma$, $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\sigma\iota$, about which Dr. Brugmann incidentally expresses opinions that will require discussion in the next volume. It is a time-honoured custom, and it seems scientific, to begin with phonetic laws, and go on to suffixes and terminations, but I am not sure

that it would not be better to reverse the order. The order of discovery has certainly been grammar first, and phonetics after; all the brilliant discoveries which are embodied in this book were made in turning over grammatical formations. And in the order of exposition, whichever end you begin at, you must bring in something from the other. Would it be any more illogical to say 'the accusative ended in m ; the Greek a and ν represent Indo-European m after a consonant and a vowel respectively,' than to say, as the current method does, 'Indo-European m —after a consonant it was a vowel, and is represented in Greek by $-a$, e.g. accusatives in $-a$ —after a vowel it was a consonant, and is represented in Greek by ν , e.g. accusatives in $-\nu$ '? The practical advantage of the reversed order would be that phonetic laws coming incidentally in grammar can be stated more concisely and remembered more easily, and have more self-proving power, than grammatical formations coming incidentally in phonetics. But of course this is an objection to established custom, not to Dr. Brugmann.

'Can this book be used by schoolmasters?' the practical Englishman asks. It not only can, but it must. In conjunction with the author's Greek and Dr. Stolz's Latin grammars in Iwan-Müller's *Handbuch der Klassischen Alterthumswissenschaft*, it forms a compendious and complete guide to our present knowledge of Greek and Latin grammar. The two or three points on which I have indicated a possible divergence of opinion are only a drop in the bucket; no great harm will be done if a teacher takes Dr. Brugmann as infallible on all of them. If schoolboys are to be taught any comparative grammar at all, they must be taught it on rigorous principles. Everywhere else in education we take pains to tie the youthful mind down to precise, measured, verifiable statements; in comparative philology alone we are content with 'hollow spaces planked over with the wordy ignorance which we call knowledge.' It is not, perhaps, possible as yet to teach our more minute and complicated formulae to schoolboys; the immediate necessity is to get rid of the old indiscriminate formulae. It is better to say nothing about vowels than to call them 'Indo-European a ,' better to leave $\beta\acute{\alpha}\theta\omicron\varsigma$ — $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\theta\omicron\varsigma$ unexplained than to talk about 'nasal insertion.' It is to be hoped that, for the present, colleges will cease to tempt schoolboys with questions on comparative philology in their scholarship papers; but let me assure teachers that a candidate

never loses and often gains by leaving those questions alone. While I am suggesting, may I add that we may all do one small service to our science, for which no new knowledge is wanted! We may cease to call it 'philology.'

T. C. SNOW.

Some points of Roman Law in Prof. Tyrrell's Edition of Cicero's Correspondence. Vols. I., II. Dublin Univ. Press. £1 4s.

THIS edition has been so heartily and generally welcomed that I occupy no space with praising it. It is a pleasant and scholarly work. But I wish even now the editor would put the various readings at the foot of the page, and not assume the correctness of the chronological order adopted by his predecessors. In using it I have noticed a few passages where he seems to me to have mistaken the law, and some other slips which may be more briefly dealt with. I take the more important passages first, out of their proper order.

Letter cxxi. *Fam.* vii. 13. *Tantum metuo ne artificium tuum tibi parum prosit: nam, ut audio, istic 'non ex iure manum consortum sed magis ferro rem repetunt,' et tu soles ad vim faciundam adhiberi: neque est quod illam exceptionem in interdicto pertimescas, 'quo tu prior vi hominibus armatis non ueneris'; scio enim te non esse procacem in lacescendo.*

Trebatius, the lawyer, is attending Caesar in his camp in Gaul, and Cicero chaffs him on his position. 'I am only afraid, that your professional craft is of little good to you, for, I am told, where you are (to quote Ennius) "men don't join issue in due course of law, but effect a recovery sword in hand," and actually *you* are now called in to use force! Well, there is no ground for much fear of your being troubled with the plea of having been the first to come with a force of armed men, for I know you are not forward in attack.'

Trebatius, if dispossessed of some land by armed violence, would apply to the praetor for an interdict which would state the issue in some such words as these, addressed to his opponent: *Unde tu, C. Trebatium vi hominibus armatis deicisti, eo C. Trebatium restituas.* If, however, Trebatius had himself previously turned out his opponent by the like means, the opponent would urge the praetor to insert in the formula after '*deicisti*' *quo ille prior vi hominibus armatis non uenerit*; and the praetor would naturally consent. The matter would then be

referred to a judge to decide with these instructions. If the judge found that Trebatius had been ejected by armed force and had not himself been the aggressor by the same means, the injunction would be made final, and the defendant probably be condemned in damages: if his prior aggression were proved or his dispossession not proved, the injunction would drop and in some cases the plaintiff would pay a forfeit (cf. *Gai* iv. 141, 161-165).

There is I think no doubt that the interdict referred to is *de vi armata* (which in the Digest is consolidated with that *de vi Dig.* xliii. 16). Prof. Tyrrell erroneously takes it to be the interdict *uti possidetis*, and naturally finds difficulties. He has been misled by the language of *Cic. Caecin.* 22, § 63 and *Gai* iv. 155, whence he infers that no *exceptiones* were allowed when armed force had been used. It is not necessary to assume in either passage that such a plea as we have here was in question. But that such a plea was allowable is, I think, clear (1) from this passage itself; (2) from the analogy of the interdict '*de ui*' (cf. *Cic. Caecin.* § 92); (3) from the reason of the thing, supported by the language of the Digest.

The use of armed violence in matters of ejectment was rightly held to be so contrary to the dignity of legal procedure as to require peremptory prohibition. Accordingly a person who had himself acquired possession from his opponent by force (*vi*, not *vi armata*) or by stealth or by sufferance was yet entitled to immediate restoration, if his opponent ejected him by armed force. Obviously the same principle applies against him, if he has himself used armed force. His own armed violence disentitles him from claiming the peremptory protection of the law, on the same principle on which armed violence disentitles his opponent from pleading the wrongful possession of the former. Indeed the two acts may well have been successive events in one day's struggle. If Trebatius (in the supposed case) had brought a body of armed men to dispossess his opponent, he could not be aggrieved by his opponent's resorting to the same means to dispossess him in turn. *Eum qui cum armis uenit, possumus armis repellere, sed hoc confestim, non ex interuallo; dummodo sciamus non solum resistere permissum ne deiciatur, sed, et si deiectus quis fuerit, eundem deicere non ex interuallo sed ex continenti.* (Ulpian in *Dig.* xliii. § 16, l. 3, § 9; and cf. l. 1, § 27, 28.)

(Keller *Semestr.* p. 333 *sqq.* suggests that the absence of this plea in later times was due to a restriction of the meaning of *deicere*, so that it was held to be no ejectment, if a person recovered by force what he lost by force).

Cicero refers to this same interdict in *Fam.* xv. 16, § 3, and of course frequently in the speeches for Caecina and Tullius.

Bruns (*Die Besitzklagen*, p. 42) and others take the words *et tu soles ad vim faciendam adhiberi* to refer to conventional force in the course of legal procedure. I do not think that is the natural meaning of the words, and I doubt the employment of jurisconsults for the purpose. Of course there is a playful allusion to it, point being given by the infrequency of Trebatius being so employed.

Letter cxlviii. *Q. Pr.* iii. 1, § 3. *Calvus aiebat aqua dempta et eius aquae iure constituto et servitute fundo illi imposita, tamen nos pretium servare posse si vendere vellemus.*

Prof. Tyrrell translates 'Calvus (probably a jurisconsult) holds that even if the use of the water were not included in the sale and the right of the vendor over it were established, and the estate were made liable for the water (were made subject to this easement) we could still get our purchase-money for it if we wished to sell.'

This is wrong in several places. Calvus (if this be the right reading) was probably a land agent. A jurisconsult is not the man to tell the value of an estate. The precise relations of the estates are not certain, but I understand the *fundus Bovillanus* to be the same as the land said at the beginning of the section to have been bought at Arpinum from Fufidius, and to be well off for water. Arpinum and (the known) Bovillae are many miles apart, so that the meaning of *Bovillanus* is uncertain. I take *Arpini* to be merely the place of purchase. At any rate Quintus had the intention of taking water from one estate to another. I translate; 'Calvus declared that if the water were taken away, and the right of drawing it were established, and a servitude imposed on that estate, we should still get our price.' As owner of the two estates Quintus could deal with the water as he liked. But if he sold the estate whence he took the water, he would have to declare in the conveyance that he sold subject to this right. That would be establishing for the dominant estate (where he used the water) a *iūs aquae ducendae*, and imposing on the servient estate the obligation to allow the water to be so taken. *Iūs aquae*

(*ducendae*) *constituere* is a regular technical phrase, cf. *Dig.* viii. 5, l. 10, *de iure quo aqua constituta est*; *ib.* l. 18, *antequam is actori iūs aquae ducendae constituisset*, &c.

A little earlier in the section Prof. Tyrrell notes on the words *piscina et salientibus additis* that 'springs, not jets d'eau,' are meant by *salientibus*. Surely the natural translation is just the reverse, 'if you add a basin and some jets d'eau.' Cf. *Dig.* xix. 1, l. 15.

Letter cxlix. *Att.* iv. 17. This famous passage, describing the monstrous agreement made between the consuls of the year 54 B.C. and two of the candidates, has been the subject of much discussion. *Consules flagrant infamia, quod C. Memmius candidatus pactionem in senatu recitavit, quam ipse suusque competitor Domitius cum consulibus fecisset, uti ambo H.S. quadragena consulibus darent si essent ipsi consules facti, nisi tris augures dedissent, qui se adfuisse dicerent, cum lex curiata ferretur quae non lata esset, et duo consulares, qui se dicerent in ornandis provinciis consularibus scribendo adfuisse cum omnino ne senatus quidem fuisset. Haec pactio, non verbis sed nominibus et perscriptionibus multorum tabulis cum esse facta diceretur, prolata a Memmio est nominibus inductis auctore Pompeio.*

Prof. Tyrrell objects to the usual interpretation of *inductis* as 'cancelled' on the ground that that meaning is here unsuitable. If it is supposed that Memmius cancelled the main items of the agreement, how could he prove his case, and what was the object of cancelling either names of contracting parties or anything, when his natural course was to lay the compact before the senate just as it stood? Boot supposes that the consuls, not Memmius, did the cancelling; but Prof. Tyrrell replies that the consuls would be more likely to have destroyed the whole instrument. Rein supposes that the *nomina* cancelled were the same *nomina* named before, viz. the entries in ledgers. v. Salpius (*Novation und Delegation*, p. 94) understands the consuls to have cancelled the book-entries and Memmius to have produced the written agreement: *nominibus inductis* is then 'after the entries had been cancelled.' Prof. Tyrrell thinks *inductis* should be taken as *inducere* in *Verr.* i. § 106 and *inductur* and *induceretis* in *Rull.* ii. §§ 70, 98; and translated 'duly entered.' He reiterates this opinion in the Preface, p. xi.

I think this makes the words *nominibus inductis* quite otiose, and that there is no reason for giving an unusual meaning of a

usual meaning to *inductis*; (for *inducere*, 'to cancel,' see Dirksen's *Manuale*, s.v.). I believe the *nomina* cancelled were the *nomina* of the three augurs and the two consulars who were to give false evidence, and it does not matter for this purpose whether the *nomina* were names or entries or items, and whether the *pactio* was a separate written document or not. It may have been such, but as the *pactio* is said to have been made *nominiibus et perscriptionibus multorum tabulis*, it seems better to suppose no such separate written document containing the whole plot to have existed. It was not made *verbis*, i.e. by a formal stipulation such as was usually applied to bind a bargain. How then was it made? That in some degree depends on the meaning which we attach to *perscriptionibus*, and, as the word occurs in several passages, it is worth while to examine it.

Perscribere is used of writing a matter out in full (e.g. Cic. *Cat.* iii. § 13, &c.), and *perscriptio* is thus 'a writing of some transaction.' But the precise nature of the writing so denoted is not easy to determine. It evidently had a business meaning, but whether this meaning was wide and general or specific is not clear. (a) In *Rosc. Com.* §§ 1, 2, 5 it appears clearly to be used of entries in the ledger, descriptive of the person credited or debited with sums of money. In *Flac.* § 44 the meaning is the same, only that the entry gave a description of the particular purpose of the payment as well as of the name of the creditor or debtor. Similarly in *Verr.* v. § 48 and *Ter. Phorm.* 923 (if we read with most MSS. *perscripsi* instead of the Bembine *discripsi*). (b) In the tablets found at Pompeii (Bruns' *Fontes* ii. cap. 9) *perscriptio* is the title ('docket') affixed to some documents which in form are certificates of receipt of money. And yet (c) a third mercantile meaning seems to be given by Cic. *Att.* xii. 51 *Tiro narravit perscriptionem tibi placere* and xvi. 2, § 1 *quod perscribi oportet* which clearly imply some mode of settling a debt—probably something in the nature of a bill of exchange drawn upon a banker at some distance of time, e.g. a six months' bill. And in *Liv.* xxiv. 18, § 14 *a quaestore perscribebatur* we have clearly bills drawn on the quaestor. (For this use of the preposition a cf. Cic. *Flac.* § 44). Perhaps these three meanings may be reconciled by supposing *perscribere*, *perscriptio* to mean originally simply 'expression of the debt in writing' and to be specially applied to entries in a ledger or to receipts or to orders on a banker. It is possible to com-

bine the two last, as in warrants on the English Treasury, which contain a receipt for the money, to be signed by the payee and exchanged by his banker against payment. In *Att.* ix. 12 § 3, where Cicero is describing how the world generally is going on in the regular routine (notwithstanding the political crisis implied by Pompey's being actually besieged by a Roman army), he says *virī boni usuras perscribunt* 'honest men are entering up their interest,' where the *virī* may be the creditors (according to Mommsen, *Hermes* xii. p. 112) or the debtors. So Cic. *Orat.* i. 58 *de tabulis et perscriptionibus* may well be merely 'about ledgers and entries,' but may also be 'about documents and receipts (or cheques).' In *Phil.* v. § 11 Antony is described as squandering public money *falsis perscriptionibus donationibusque* 'by fictitious book entries (or receipts or cheques) and gifts'; fictitious, because professing to be in accordance with Caesar's orders. *Suet. Caes.* 42 *deducto siquid usurae nomine numeratum aut perscriptum fuisset*; 'less anything which had been paid in cash or by cheque (or book entry) under the head of interest.'

It is thus hard to say the precise meaning of *perscriptionibus* in our passage. But whether *perscriptionibus* is the fuller description of the nature of the debt and *nominiibus* the mere entry of money paid to, or received by, a person named, or again *nominiibus* includes the whole of the book entry and *perscriptionibus* denotes a number of warrants for payment in some shape or other, in either case the bargain with the consuls was contained in a number of books and documents.

I do not see how the dependence of the payments on the consuls' good faith could be secured by these documents. And for this purpose a *pactio ne peteretur* (to guard against the payments being enforced if the consuls played false) may have been necessary and may have been put in writing and may have been read out in the senate.

But it is not likely that the agreement was made in blind confidence that some three augurs and some two consulars would be found ready for the plot. I think particular persons were first secured; book entries or money orders in their favour were made and provisionally (at any rate) executed. But as Memmius or some one blotted out the names, Cicero could describe only the general character of the plot and the number of augurs and consulars concerned.

If it be insisted that *nominiibus* should mean the same in both places (I do not think

it at all necessary), we may suppose that the whole or part of the book entries were blotted out, but that yet from the remainder or from the context the nature of the entry may have been sufficiently discoverable to support the evidence afforded by the *perscriptiones* or by Memmius' confession.

[Mommsen (*Hermes* xii. p. 111) considers *perscriptio* to be a 'payment accompanied by a formal receipt' and endeavours, not successfully, as I think, to reduce all the passages under this meaning].

Letter ix. *Att. i. 4. Cui cum aequi fuissimus, tamen* &c. Tunstall, Boot, and Tyrrell all take this as meaning 'though I might have taken a lenient view (had I so willed).' I cannot think Cicero would have so used a simple pluperfect subjunctive instead of a periphrasis with *possum* or the future participle (cf. my grammar, § 1521). Why not translate, 'Although I had been favourable to him'? The verdict was that of the judges. Cicero gained general applause, because the verdict was approved and he had presided as praetor in an able and impartial manner, notwithstanding his feeling for the defendant.

Letter xx. *Att. i. 14, § 3.* Cicero says that the support given him by Crassus in the senate was the more remarkable *quod meis omnibus litteris in Pompeiana laude perstrictus esset*. Prof. Tyrrell inserts *orationibus* after *meis* and calls (in the second edition) *omnibus litteris* an *ablativus mensurae*. The ablative of measure is however only used with comparatives or expressions of precedence or distance. Still *omnibus meis litteris* may mean (cf. my grammar, § 1170) 'throughout all my letters' or 'throughout all my literary compositions,' and in either case offers no difficulty requiring addition to the text. A person writing to his intimate friends does not always so express himself as to leave nothing obscure to persons 1900 years after in *ultima Thule*.

In the next section *Aperte tecte* is explained rightly in the beginning of the note and wrongly in the end. Cicero would never put two such adverbs to qualify, instead of to contrast with, one another.

Letter liii. *Q. Fr. i. 2. Rogo ut procuratoribus Flavii remittas de deminuendo*. Prof. Tyrrell oddly translates 'allow them to draw on the money,' and says if the word *remittas* were here to be taken in its more usual sense of 'making a concession,' 'letting off,' Cicero would have written '*de non deminuendo*.' But if we take *de* as meaning 'concerning,' not 'from,' *non* is not necessary (see Prof. Tyrrell's own note on *missione*,

letter i, § 3). Quintus had at the request of a creditor ordered Flavius' agents not to impair the estate of L. Octavius Naso, to which Flavius was heir, till the debt was paid. Marcus points out to his brother that he had rashly assumed that the claim was good and had thereby done injustice to Naso. He requests Quintus therefore to withdraw his order. 'I beg you to make a concession to Flavius' agents in the matter of impairing the estate.' *Deminuere* is used somewhat technically. Cf. *Cic. Flac. § 84; Dig. xviii. 1, l. 26; xxviii. 8, l. 17*.

Letter cxxvi. *Fam. vii. 23, § 2. Tu autem ignarus instituti mei, quanti ego genus omnino signorum omnium non aestimo, tanti ista quattuor aut quinque sumpsisti*. Prof. Tyrrell (see also the *Corrigenda*) apparently misunderstands the passage, for he proposes to omit *non*, to read *aestinem* for *aestimo*, to treat *tanti* and *quanti* as not correlative, and to regard *quanti* as = *quantuli*. I do not see the difficulty. Fadius Gallus had bought for Cicero some statues of Bacchae and one of Mars, and had given a high price. Cicero wanted some cheap statues for his palaestra of a totally different kind, perhaps something respectable, as philosophers, &c. 'In your ignorance of my ways (or purpose) you have bought those four or five statues at a price at which I don't value all the statues in the world.'

Letter cliv. *Att. iv. 18. Sulla non dubitans quin foris esset, (Gabinium) postularat*. Prof. Tyrrell doubts what he says is the common interpretation of *foris esset* 'was in debt,' but still inclines to a metaphorical use 'was out at elbows,' 'was a defaulter': see p. 183 and pref. xii, xxi. In the other passage where it is used, also of Gabinus, (*Pis. § 2*) Madvig reads *sordidissime* and treats this supposed use of *foris esse* with scorn. Why may not Sulla have thought Gabinus to be 'away from home'? I see no occasion for a metaphorical meaning in this letter. If the words be retained in the speech, it is perhaps possible to take it as 'on the world,' i.e. not a steady citizen living at home on his own means.

Letter clx. *Q. Fr. iii. 9, § 8.* Prof. Tyrrell translates '*tabulas obsignare*' 'sign the will.' The expression is incorrect. Roman wills were not executed by 'signing.' They were written (by any one), declared in the presence of witnesses to be the testator's will, and then the tablets were sealed up (*obsignantur*) by the witnesses. The sealing was not for execution, but to protect the contents from being altered. The same with other documents: see *Cic. Flac. § 21* and the regu-

lations for opening wills in Dig. xxix. 3. Even *subscribere*, *scriptio*, when used in such matters, did not mean what we moderns understand, viz. the mere writing of the executant's name, but a declaration, e.g. *Decretum. Fieri placet. Iubentius Celsus promagister subscripsi* (Wilmann's *Inscr.* no. 312). The '*scriptio*' of the testator to wills was first required by a constitution of Theodosius II. anno 439: see the elaborate essay of Bruns' *Die Unterschriften*, &c. in his *Kleine Schriften*, bd. ii.

Letter clxii. *Fam.* i. 10 (misprinted 20).

Illo si ueneris, tamquam Ulixes, cognosces tuorum neminem. Prof. Tyrrell, to save Cicero from the charge of not knowing his Homer well, accepts Klotz's conjecture of *cognoscere nemini*. But is this Ciceronian Latin? Ovid, no doubt, could say and said *lugebere nobis*, but Cicero would not use a dative of the agent with a finite verb, except where 'for' a person is as suitable a meaning as 'by' him, e.g. *N. D.* ii. 48 *bestiis cibis quaeritur*; *Q. Fr.* i. 1, 25 *aes alienum contrahi civitatibus*.

H. J. ROBY.

SHORTER NOTICES.

Novum Testamentum, etc. curante F. H. A. SCRIVENER. Editio Major. Deighton, Bell et Soc: MDCCCLXXXVII. 4s. 6d.

THIS is a third, and greatly enlarged and improved edition of a well-known work, the first edition of which appeared in 1859, and the second in 1876. As before, the text of Stephens of 1550 is taken as the standard, while the chief variations are given in footnotes. The main features of this new edition are that (1) to the readings adopted by Beza, Elzevir, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles have been added those of Westcott and Hort and of the Revisers; (2) carefully selected references to parallel passages have been inserted in the outer margin; (3) for the convenience of those who use this volume in collating MSS., the Ammonian sections and Eusebian canons are given in the inner margin, a table of these being added to the Preface. The paging is the same as in the second edition; room for this additional matter being obtained by increasing the size of the page. But the volume may still be carried in a fairly capacious pocket. In a few paragraphs added to the former Preface the learned editor speaks with gratitude, admiration, and severity of the work of Westcott and Hort. There is no need to praise their fine intelligence, immense learning, industry, and sagacity. These rare gifts, while they excite our envy, fail (in Dr. Scrivener's judgment) *τὸν ἥττω λόγον κρείττω ποιεῖν*. Still half enslaved by the principles of Lachmann, they have gone wider of what Dr. Scrivener believes to be the truth than even Lachmann himself, and have produced a magnificent blunder rather than an everlasting possession (*splendidum peccatum, non κτήμα εἰς αἶν, in lucem emiserunt*).

The Resultant Greek Testament, exhibiting the Text in which the Majority of Modern Editors are agreed, by R. F. WEYMOUTH, D. LIT. Elliot Stock: pp. xix. 644. 12s. 6d.

THIS work agrees with the preceding one in giving a Greek Text of the New Testament with a careful digest of the various readings adopted by editors; but it proceeds on a very different plan. Instead of adopting the exceedingly faulty text of Stephens as a standard, the editor constructs one for himself; not at first hand from MSS., Versions and Fathers, but at second hand from the most important editions of the last fifty years. His principle, therefore, is the same as that which for some years has been adopted in the *Cambridge Greek Testament*: but it is worked out in a much more comprehensive way. The editors

of that series have confined their attention mainly to Tischendorf and Tregelles, with occasional reference to Lachmann. Dr. Weymouth lays under contribution, not only these three great critics, but also Alford, the Bâle edition of 1880, Westcott and Hort, and the Revisers, together with Lightfoot and Elliott for S. Paul's Epistles, and Weiss for S. Matthew. This eclectic text, therefore, 'is intended to exhibit in a compact and intelligible form the latest results of textual criticism.' Hence the somewhat peculiar title, '*The Resultant Greek Testament*.'

Of the materials used only two require separate mention. The Bâle edition was edited in 1880 for the Bible Society of Bâle by Stockmeyer and Riggenbach. It is largely influenced by Tischendorf, and where it differs from him frequently anticipates the readings of Westcott and Hort. '*Das Matthäusevangelium*' of Bernhard Weiss was published at Halle in 1876. Its text also is greatly under the influence of Tischendorf.

The work has been executed with the greatest care; the proofs having been corrected, not from the 'copy' sent to the press, but from the editions themselves from which the 'copy' was taken. The accuracy of the readings quoted has, therefore, been doubly secured.

A student with either Scrivener or Weymouth in his hand can at once see what reading has been adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort, and the Revisers in any given passage; but with Weymouth he has the suffrages of other editors as well. Nor is this the only advantage. Weymouth's text is as clear and as free from interruptions as that of Westcott and Hort, and like theirs is spaced in accordance with the sense. In Scrivener the frequent changes of type, and still more frequent insertions of letters and numerals, are trying to the eyes. Besides which, it is much pleasanter to work with a text to which all the best modern critics would in most cases assent, rather than with one from which nearly every one, excepting Dean Burgon, would be perpetually dissenting.

The two works have appeared almost simultaneously, and Dr. Weymouth was evidently unaware that Dr. Scrivener had a third edition in preparation. It is interesting to contrast his opinion of Westcott and Hort with that of Dr. Scrivener, quoted above. He is convinced 'that critical judgment will more and more converge towards most of the conclusions arrived at by WH,' and he speaks of their Greek Testament as 'a work beyond all praise, both for the erudition displayed and for the simple

beauty of its "guileless workmanship," a work which will survive "aere perennius" long after unworthy vituperation has been forgotten.' We have no hesitation in assenting to this view rather than to the other.

Dr. Weymouth has had the advantage of twenty years' acquaintance with Tregelles while his work was in progress. He, therefore, speaks with some authority when he suggests what would have been the verdict of Tregelles, if he had had all the evidence which is now available. By a change of type in the foot-notes he lets us know the cases in which Tregelles, and Lachmann before him, arrived at a decision upon evidence which would now be considered as defective. In all such cases their authority is obviously of less weight. This is a further advantage which Weymouth's edition has over Scrivener's.

A. PLUMMER.

The First Epistle of S. John, with Exposition and Homiletical Treatment, by the Rev. J. J. LIAS, M.A. Nisbet and Co. 1887. 7s. 6d.

READERS of the *Homiletic Magazine* are already acquainted with this useful commentary. During the last five or six years it has been appearing piecemeal in that periodical, and now has been reprinted in a separate volume, as it well deserves to be. The plan is simple. The greater portion of each page is occupied by a pretty full explanation of the Epistle, clause by clause, a smaller portion at the foot being reserved for skeleton sermons on the passages expounded above. The Authorised Version is used, but is frequently corrected. The author takes a very modest view of his own labours. 'His task has simply been to select from the various commentaries before him such matter as seemed to him most likely to be useful to those for whom his own was originally designed.' But there are some good things in the volume which (so far as our knowledge reaches) are not to be found elsewhere; in particular the explanation of the very perplexing change of tense from the triple 'I write' to the triple 'I wrote' or 'I have written' in ii. 12-14, and the exposition of v. 6-8.

A. PLUMMER.

The Pulpit Commentary: Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians. Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1886. £1 1s.

THE greater part of this bulky volume consists of homiletical materials by various authors, who represent leading types of modern evangelical Christian thought. Of this we have read sufficient to convince us that it is a valuable storehouse of practical suggestions for preachers; but it is the remaining and smaller part of the volume, the 'Introductions' to the separate epistles, and the 'Exposition' of the Greek text, with which we are here concerned. Mr. Findlay's labours on *Colossians* furnish a real addition to our literature on the exegesis of this difficult epistle, and are quite deserving of separate publication. Mr. Caffin has carefully read and inwardly digested the best commentaries on Philippians, and is always scholarly and acceptable in his abridgments and re-presentation of them, but modestly refrains from striking out any new lines or advancing much original thought. Prof. Blaikie may without loss be left unread by those who possess any other commentary on the text of Ephesians: he scarcely deigns to notice the labours of previous scholars, and he is perpetually deserting his proper task of exegesis to indulge in the apparently more congenial and certainly less laborious occupation of sermonizing. The editors would perhaps have done better to have included him amongst the 'Homilists,' instead of numbering him with the writers of 'Scholarly Introduc-

tions' and 'such Exposition as shall meet the wants of the Student.'

The volume has probably been a long time in preparation, and this may account for some of the work being disappointingly not 'up to date.' It is not quite creditable, for instance, that in a book published at the end of 1886, neither Commentator nor Homilist says a word about the *Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων* (given to the world by Bryennios in 1883) either on 'bishops and deacons' in Phil. i. 1, or on 'apostles and prophets' in Eph. iv. 11; no wonder, after that, that the term 'apostles' is treated as though referring only to the Twelve.

Meyer's attractive explanation of ἀρταγμός in Phil. ii. 6, stoutly upheld in the *Expositor* for Feb. 1887 by J. Agar Beet, is rejected by Mr. Caffin, as it previously was, perhaps rather too summarily, in a foot-note, by Bishop Lightfoot.

T. RANDELL.

Platonis Apologia Socratis, with Introduction, Notes, and Appendices, by J. ADAM, B.A., Fellow and Classical Lecturer of Emmanuel College, Cambridge. (Cambridge University Press.) 1887. 3s. 6d.

THIS is a good specimen of the improved school book of modern days. It contains a well-written introduction (pp. v.-xxxii.), an appendix on the text, in which the doubtful readings are discussed and some account is given of the principal MSS. (pp. 123-132); and it closes with a fair index. The explanatory notes are sensible and to the point, grappling with real difficulties and showing competent knowledge and ability. In a word the book may be pronounced a worthy representative of English scholarship. We note a few points in which we think there is room for improvement. 17 A, why should the ordinary ὁπὸ ἀφ' ὧν, and again after ὁνομα ἔχετε (38 C) and ὁφλόν (39 B) be noticed, and nothing said of the less common use after ἐπελαθόμεν? 17 C, ἐπὶ τῶν τραπέζων, is there any reason to confine this to bankers' counters? It seems more suited to Socrates' indiscriminate love of talk to take it (with Rost and Palm) generally of the stalls in the market. So Wyttienbach (*Plut. Mor.* 70 E) explains it *ad mensas tabernariorum, opificum, nummulariorum*. 19 A, οὐ πάνν, though it is conclusively shown in appendix C. to Cope's translation of the *Gorgias*, that this phrase cannot always be taken = πάνν οὐ, yet μόγος πάνν below (21 B) and the parallels cited by Shilleto on *Thuc.* I. 3, not to mention the greater appropriateness of the strong sense in passages like 42 D, οὐ πάνν χαλεπαίνω, make it doubtful whether the ironical interpretation is to be universally accepted. It should be noted that the same ambiguity as to the application of the negative is found in the Latin *non omnino*. 19 C, τοσαύτας δίκας, 'can hardly mean so grave a charge,' p. 125. Why not? the plural having a quasi-singular force, there is no need to take τοσαύτας = tot. 23 A, τὸ δὲ κινδυνεύει τῷ ὄντι ὁ θεὸς σοφὸς εἶναι, here it is said τὸ is the 'acc. in apposition to the sentence'; similarly τοῦναντίον is said to be acc. in apposition to sentence in 25 B, ἡ καὶ περὶ ἵππους οὕτω σοὶ δοκεῖ εἶχεν . . . ἢ τοῦναντίον τούτου πάνν, εἰς μὲν τις ὁ βελτίους οἶός τ' ἂν ποιεῖν . . . οἱ δὲ πολλοί—διαφθείρουσιν, and in 34 A. So again in 39 B, τὸ δὲ δὴ μετὰ τούτῳ ἐπιθυμῶ ὑμῖν χρησμεύησαι, (which is translated 'in the next place,') τὸ is called 'acc. in apposition to sentence.' This appears to us a wrong explanation. In 23 A, we take τὸ δὲ to be properly the subject to κινδυνεύει, in 25 B, τοῦναντίον to be subject to δοκεῖ, both being explained by the following nominatives in apposition, like the famous passage in *Thuc.* ii. 40, ὁ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀμαθία μὲν θράσος, λογισμὸς δὲ ὕκνον φέρει, which

may be considered a contraction from δ τοῖς ἄλλοις $\epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota$ ὡς κ.τ.λ., or more strictly speaking, the vague δ bifurcates into ἀμαθία μὲν (λογισμὸς δέ. In 39 B we should prefer to take τὸ δέ either as acc. of respect, which is closely connected with the acc. of extent, or as direct object of χρῆσθαι, like ταῦτα after μαρτυρούμενος in the last sentence of the same chapter. In 36 A we are glad to see that the loose τὸ μὲν μὴ ἀγανακτεῖν is satisfactorily explained without having recourse to an 'adverbial acc. in apposition.' As regards the text Mr. Adam is in general judiciously conservative. Once or twice he gives ingenious and plausible emendations, as of the corrupt μάλλον οὐδὲν ἀληθές in 18 B. We doubt, however, his change of αὐτὸ τὸ τοῦ Ὁμήρου (34 D) into αὐτὸ τὸ τ. Ὁ. 'To quote Homer again' would be a natural apology, if there had been a quotation made a few lines before, but not after an interval of some pages. The reading of the MSS. makes excellent sense 'this is just what Homer means by his οὐκ ἀπὸ δούσης.' Nor do we think that the reading μὴ ὑπέκταν δέ ἅμα καὶ ἅμα ἂν ἀποδοῖμην (32 A) can be defended by a parallel in which two finite verbs are united by a double ἅμα. Riddell's ἅμα κἄν seems all that can be desired. It might be as well if the editor gave a note showing how he understood the μὴ with ὑπέκταν. Just below 'forensic' seems hardly an appropriate rendering for δικάσιαι. Socrates is not referring to any technicalities of the law, but to such appeals to the feelings of the jury as were common in the law courts. We have only noticed one misprint of any importance, p. 77, line 12 from bottom, where 'loss' should be changed into 'insertion.'

Cæsar, Bell. Gall. V. Edited by C. COLBECK. Macmillan. 1s. 6d.

THIS seems to us an excellent school-book. The introduction is a model of compressed yet lucid and interesting information; a particularly excellent feature being the illustrations. For example, besides good maps, on p. 29 we have pictures of *pilum*, *gladius*, *turris*, and *ballista*, which are better than pages of description, and on the opposite side the appearance of a legionary soldier and the *testudo* is made plain at a glance, by cuts taken from Trajan's column.

In the notes the worst dangers are avoided, namely, excessive aid, oppressive prolixity, and superfluous erudition. Occasionally Mr. Colbeck omits a point which seems to require a word: as for instance on p. 44, where *decerno* with *inf.* is passed over: p. 45 the suboblique *quod timeret* is also unnoticed in the notes, though it specially needs attention as it is followed by the illogical idiom *quod diceret*: perhaps *huc accedebat* (6. 6) wants a word. From sins of commission the notes seem very free. We have only observed one awkwardly stated comment (on iii. 22) where it would be clearer to say that when the comparative is used in a final clause it takes *quo* (abl. of measure): one misprint (*si* for *sui*, viii. 21): and an obscure philological note on *per* (xxx. 7), which it were better to omit or explain more fully. And is not the identification of Arminius with Hermann now given up by the best authorities?

But on the whole the notes are sound, short, clear, and to the point: and the difficult geography is particularly well and thoroughly dealt with. The book has a vocabulary.

Livy—The Last Two Kings of Macedon. Selected. Edited by F. H. RAWLINS, M.A. 3s. 6d.

WE are glad to see a new portion of Livy brought within the reach of boys, by these extracts from books 31–45. Perhaps there are rather too many

notes (text, 68 pp., notes, 137 pp.): but Mr. Rawlins' work seems well and soundly done. His thoroughness is shown by the ample instances collected for exceptional usages, e.g., omission of object in technical phrases (p. 84), prepositions depending on nouns (p. 82), predicative participle (p. 86), adj. and partic. (p. 150): though occasionally perhaps needless, as in the mass of instances of abl. of separation (p. 77), historic infin. (p. 80), *ad* 'with a view to' (p. 89). Some people might object to the occasional philological notes (e.g., derivations of *coepi*, *infensus*, *incho*, *dubius*, *luxuria*, *semita*, *templum*, *obliviscor*): but we rather agree that a sprinkling of the less obvious derivations is an improvement to a lesson, and is stimulating even if unsystematic.

In a few places improvements might perhaps be made. Thus (p. 76) the dat. *irritandis animis* is correctly explained, but why introduce the old error of gerundive being *future*? on (p. 78) *trinum nundinum* is explained as 24 days (3×8) instead of 17 ($2 \times 8 + 1$). The note on *potius quam* with subj. (p. 118) is obscure: *pergit ire* is illustrated by *βῆ δ' ἰέναι*, a misleading suggestion, as though *pergo* meant 'I go': *dum viveret se defensurus* (p. 149) is rather final than indefinite: the note (p. 203) on *oportuerat* is not clear, as the indic. is quite normal, and we have rather to explain why it is not *oportuit* than why it is not *oportuisset*. But these are few, while the good notes are numerous.

The historical notes are brief, but clear and sufficient. Polybius is kept in view all through: and the schoolboy will be specially pleased with Livy's mistranslations (p. 112).

M. Tulli Ciceronis Oratio Philippica Secunda. With Introduction and Notes by A. G. PESKETT, M.A. (Cambridge, Pitt Press Series). 1887. 3s. 6d.

THE latest addition to the Pitt Press Series is an edition of the Second Philippic by Mr. Peskett. We confess that we do not see the need of another edition of this speech. Mr. Peskett is necessarily very largely indebted to his predecessors, Halm and Mayor,—and the amount of fresh material that he has added is hardly sufficient to justify an intrusion into a field that was already occupied. Mr. Peskett has done his work carefully and well, but we cannot but regret that his trouble was not better employed upon another subject. He has the advantage over Mr. Mayor in the printing and arrangement of his notes, which will doubtless make this edition more attractive to the junior students for whom it is intended; but we are afraid that these will not be much edited by references to Dräger's Syntax, nor indeed is this book in the hands of every schoolmaster. In one or two cases we should be inclined to differ from Mr. Peskett. The contrast of *accidit* and *contigit* in § 17 can hardly be merely verbal, as he seems to imply—and the mood of *diceret* in § 7 (*at etiam litteras, quas me sibi misisse diceret, recitavit homo*) is not satisfactorily accounted for as consecutive. In both cases we should prefer the explanation of Halm. Nor should *vestrum* be explained as a contraction of *vestrorum*. The notes contain some valuable remarks by Dr. J. S. Reid. We regret to see that even he can give no satisfactory explanation of ch. 32–33.—G. C.

Cicero de Suppliciis, par ÉMILE THOMAS: *Oratio de Signis* (same Editor). Hachette et Cie. Each 1 f. 50.

THESE are charming little editions to look at: neat print, many pretty illustrations, the very minimum of notes—hardly more than six or eight lines at the bottom of each page. We fear the ordinary English schoolmaster would think there was not enough grammar in the notes: or that when grammar points

are explained they are explained too much by reference to the special case, generally by a mere rendering, and too little by reference to principles. This is true: and obviously the end aimed at is different from that of the common English school-book. The object of M. Thomas is not so much to make the boy a good grammarian, as to help him to read Cicero with ease and pleasure. We are strongly inclined to think that the English boy would learn Latin better and quicker by a judicious mixture of M. Thomas' method with the ordinary one. Anyhow, we get here (for 3 francs) two speeches of Cicero, with enough notes to read the text without interruption, admirable maps (*lying open with the text*), brief historical introduction, and charming illustrations.

Cicéron Jurisconsulte, par ARMAND GASQUY. 304 pages. Paris, Thorin. 5 fr.

It is pleasant to find continually fresh evidence of classical studies and scholarly antiquarianism among our French neighbours. The present work is an explanation of the subject-matter and legal difficulties in the speeches of Cicero for P. Quinctius, Q. Roscius the comedian, A. Caecina, and M. Tullius. There is a short introduction on law at Rome, and on Cicero's legal training and position, and a list of the principal passages in his writings bearing on law. I do not agree with all his explanations, but I know of no book in English or German or French which will be so useful and agreeable a companion to students of these speeches. Differences of view are certain to be found when we have to explain cases at law from the speeches of the advocate on one side only, and have but scanty information on the law from other sources. The title of M. Gasquy's book is certainly unlucky, for a jurisconsult Cicero was not. He was an orator and as such had to deal with various subject-matter in private suits, in public trials, in the senate, and before the people, and knew law, philosophy, and history enough for the purpose, but he neither drew pleadings, nor advised clients, nor taught legal students. Still in more than one instance the later law followed the line advocated by the great orator. Some other mistakes are scarcely worth mention: the Scaevolae are of course confused (p. 31), where P. Scaevola is named instead of his son Q. Scaevola the pontifex: *possideri* is derived from *potis* and *sedere* (p. 199): the *lex Julia de vi* is spoken of as if existing at the time of Cicero's speech *pro Caecina* (p. 213), and the use of *ἀνέκδοτον ἀπόλεσεν* in the Ranae is misremembered on p. 218, &c. But these things are trifles and do not seriously interfere with the clear and competent exposition of the author's subject. His sympathies are large enough to satisfy all parties. He refers to St. Thomas Aquinas on a point of trade morality (p. 24 note); he notices the large pay of a ballet-girl (p. 176); and he justly upholds against Mommsen the worth of Cicero's advocacy and of Cicero's character.—H. J. R.

A Relief Map of Syracuse, constructed mainly after Holm and Cavallari. By J. B. JORDAN and F. HAVERFIELD, M.A. London. 1886. D. Nutt. £1 5s.

SCHOOLMASTERS and other scholars to whom the topography of ancient Syracuse is a matter of some interest—all, that is, who have read with any care the narrative of Thucydides—will feel grateful to Messrs. Jordan and Haverfield. As one who has been long interested in the story of that city, illustrious alike in glory and in suffering, who has studied the Sicilian books of Thucydides both at home and on the spot, I venture with much diffidence to offer a few remarks on this very attractive map.

The vertical scale is (as usual in such maps) exaggerated, being four times as large as the horizontal.

To my eye this exaggeration is excessive, but for the purpose of teaching lads who have not been to the spot it may well be that such is not the case. The general effect is excellent: particularly when the map is kept in a horizontal position, as it should be. The scarping of the cliffs is admirably done, and the relation of the Outer City in general to the Island is made clear to a degree quite beyond the reach of ordinary maps.

When I get to the details of the Syracusan works I am met by the same doubts and difficulties as I have always felt when considering this subject. No doubt Messrs. Jordan and Haverfield have well considered the question of the probable position of the new wall built by the Syracusans in the winter of 415-4 B.C., but their map so exactly agrees with my recollections of the ground that my previous doubts about the wall remain as they were. In regard to the position of the third counterwork I heartily agree with their decision.

I note also that they do not give the great northern line of aqueduct marked by Schubring in his map. This is I suppose due to recent inquiry (of which I am ignorant) having shown that the German investigator was mistaken. But I remember that certain details noted in the course of my rambles on Achradina, and certain indications in the narrative of Thucydides, seemed to me to fall in with the plan of Schubring. He, if I remember rightly, went into the channel with the engineer in charge of the modern water supply.

Again, the interest in the locality is of a strictly military nature. It is not the great ability and wealth of its citizens, their victories in the Greek games, or the beauty of their coins, or the residence of great men, that make this little space of land so interesting, a sort of scholar's Mecca. The attraction to the pilgrim is that here he looks on the scene of three of the most important sieges of antiquity; one of which, the Athenian, has been described by an immortal pen. Now, looking at the map from this point of view, I deeply regret that—with the view no doubt of keeping down the size and weight—the peninsula of Thapsus has been omitted. Thapsus was the only base from which Syracuse was ever successfully attacked. While Nikias rested on Thapsus, all went well with him; when Mamestus moved the Roman headquarters to Leon, keeping Thapsus in his rear, it was the beginning of the end.

Let me repeat that the enterprise of Messrs. Jordan and Haverfield is deserving of great praise and speedy imitation. If I have noted points in which their results seem doubtful or slightly defective, I trust they will pardon remarks which may come of ignorance, but certainly do not come of ill-will. In looking on their map I am moved to desire a similar treatment of other sites in detail, and to dream of a beautiful large model showing to the eye the shores and islands of the Aegean Sea.—W. E. HEITLAND.

Lectures on Greek Prose. By A. SIDGWICK, M.A. Rivingtons. 4s. 6d.

MR. SIDGWICK'S plan in this volume is to let his readers see the actual process which he follows in teaching his pupils how to write Greek prose. He chooses a passage; takes it, so to speak, to pieces; shows, if need be, where the English is ambiguous, or superfluous; points out pitfalls into which beginners, or, indeed, students who are by no means beginners, may easily fall; explains differences of construction and idiom, and so gradually clears the way till at last he presents us with the piece with its whole meaning brought out in excellent Greek. Most of us have

learnt that seeing a thing well done does not by any means ensure the being able to do it oneself. Still to watch good workmanship is recognized as one of the most efficient ways of learning. Mr. Sidgwick's book will be of no use to a teacher without scholarship, or possessing scholarship, but without the capacity of teaching; but to those who possess these qualifications and lack experience it will be most instructive. Indeed there are few, even among experienced teachers, who may not get some hints from it, if not in the matter yet in the mode in which that matter is given, so fresh, so vigorous, we may say, so entertaining is it.

A Latin vocabulary arranged on etymological principles as an exercise book and first Latin dictionary for public and private use by BENJAMIN HALL KENNEDY, D.D., LL.D. *New edition revised and enlarged.* London, Longmans, Green and Co. 1887. sm. 8vo. pp. xxxiii, 156. 2s. 6d.

THIS little book, dedicated to Prof. Skeat, is designed for use as a lesson-book, with any Latin Grammar, and as a first dictionary. The introduction (pp. ix—xxxiii) treats of the derivation and composition of Latin words and the changes of root vowels. The vocabulary proper contains (1) 2692 main words in the text, with a large number of cognate and derived forms in notes; to each word its meaning in English is appended, together with its English and French offspring; (2) select proper names; (3) select list (one page) of primitive roots; (4) numerals. Beginners will here learn to exercise the reason, and not the memory only, in acquiring a *copia verborum*, and also to make their English and French lessons bear upon their progress in Latin.—J. E. B. M.

Classical Coincidences, by F. E. GRETTON, B.D., formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and Head Master of Stamford Grammar School. London. E. Stock. 1887. 2s. 6d.

THE reader must be indeed hard-hearted who does not look with indulgence on a book introduced with the words 'This sixty years exactly since I first ventured to teach classics to others, because I so much delighted in them myself. My scattered band of pupils who are yet in the flesh—*παῖδες γε πολλὰν*—must account of this booklet as their old master's *Vale...Extremum quod vos alloquor, hoc est.*' But apart from the sympathy naturally excited in us at the thought of a life whose days are thus 'bound each to each by natural piety,' there must be many who will share the author's pleasure in tracing out resemblances of thought and expression in writers of various ages, whether regarded as illustrating permanent characteristics of human nature or as showing actual imitation of an earlier by a later poet. Mr. Gretton does not seem to have been aware of the existence of other similar collections, such as those contained in Wetstein's *Notes to the Greek Testament*, or Mr. J. F. Boyes' most interesting *Illustrations of the Greek Tragedians*, in which many of his own examples may be found; but not a few of the most apposite quotations are, as far as our knowledge goes, here gleaned for the first time by himself. While thanking him for what he has given us, we hope that we need not take too literally his present farewell, but that, as in the case of Landor, we may still look forward to more 'last fruits from the old tree.'

An Introduction to Greek Sculpture. By L. E. UPCOTT, M.A. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1887. Pp. xv. 135. 4s. 6d.

INTENDED as 'a somewhat elaborate guide' to an ideal 'museum of casts and photographs, adapted to

the needs of a school.' Without professing to bring new lights to bear, the author claims to give a conspectus of the present state of foreign and English opinions on his subject. He has made the most of his limited space, which of course only admits of the barest outline of facts; though the result is somewhat dry reading as an independent work, it will probably serve as a useful introduction to a more complete study of the subject, where casts and photos are forthcoming. Like most English writers, Mr. Upcott devotes the majority of his space to the art of the Pheidias period, which occupies nearly one-third of the entire book. This leaves room for only a very brief treatment of the interesting period of the beginnings of Greek art and the sculptors of the early part of the fifth century. We could have wished for more information about this most fascinating part of the subject; this period, more than any other, illustrates the individuality of the Greek genius, and is, moreover, probably less familiar than any other to the readers for whom this work is intended.

For those who have not the time or inclination to absorb more elaborate treatises, it certainly fulfils a distinct want in England. We can only wish that the ideal museum which it presupposes might be realized in fact by the more general institution of galleries of casts. One or two inaccuracies should be corrected in a second edition; e.g., p. 31, *Anadomenos*: p. 57, the *Massimi Diskobolos* is in marble, not bronze.—[C. S.]

Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum collegit et emendavit AEMILIUS BAEHRENS. Lipsiae, 1886. (Biblioth. Teubneriana). 4 Mk. 20.

THIS volume forms an important supplement to the editor's minor Latin poets. It does not include the dramatic fragments nor the *saturnae Menippeae* of Varro, for which the reader is referred to the collections of Ribbeck and Bücheler. The preface is chiefly occupied by 'analecta ad versum Saturnium spectantia.' The foot-notes give a valuable apparatus of conjectures, including several of Munro's on Lucilius; the brilliant restoration *χρυσίον* in fr. 414 (Cic. fin. II § 83) is ascribed to Marx, but was certainly independently made by the Cambridge scholar.—J. E. B. M.

M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton Libri. Recognovit WALTHER GILBERT. Lipsiae, 1886 (Biblioth. Teubneriana). pp. xxxiv 408. 2 M. 40 Pf.

THE editor (well known as a diligent student of Martial) has had the benefit of Prof. Friedländer's counsel. In the preface he treats of orthography (the most remarkable novelties are *brachium*, 'sic semper fere libri, cf. cil. i 198 52'; *epistola*, 'quia numquam nisi G xiv 11 1 libri *epistula* praebent'; *suspicio*; *tintinabulum*) and gives an account of his critical notes, which contain the complete various readings of Schneidewin's two editions and of Scribnerius, and a selection from other editions and from MSS. Valuable additions are the 'index nominum,' pp. 380-407, and (p. 408) the dates of publication of the several books (according to Friedländer).

J. E. B. M.

Quaestiones Musonianae. De Musonio stoico Clementis Alexandrini aliorumque auctore scripsit PAULUS WENDLAND. Berlin, Mayer and Mueller, 8vo. pp. 6 and 66. 1 Mk. 80 pf.

IT augurs well for this dissertation that it is dedicated to three masters in ancient philosophy, Bücheler, Diels, Usener. Wendland, after stating that the Christian teachers in Alexandria also professed philosophy, inquires into the doctrine and age of the Stoic

followed by Clem. Al. in the paed.; his relation to Epictetus; his cynicism (comparison of Lucian's Cynic to the paed.); the relation of the essays of Musonius to the paed.; the λόγοι of Musonius as source of Clement, of Pseudo-Musonius,¹ of Justin (or Pseudo-Justin),² of Tertullian, of Plutarch. It is shewn that Clement's authority lived at Rome. In an excursus an attempt is made to restore the text of Musonius from one chapter of the paed. (III 6, on the paradox the sage alone is rich). The author displays a familiarity with the philosophy of the empire which reminds one of Gataker. His work will be of great service to future editors of Seneca, Epictetus, Plutarch, Clement, Justin, Tertullian, and appears to have proved that Clement used, not the fragments of Musonius preserved by Stobaeus, but in all probability the very λόγοι ascribed to Musonius by Suidas.

J. E. B. M.

M. Iuniani Iustini epitoma historiarum Philippiarum Pompei Trogi ex recensione FRANCISCI RUEHL. Accedunt prologi in Pompeium Trogum ab ALFREDO DE GUTSCHMID recensiti. Lipsiae, Teubner, 1886. cr. 8vo. pp. lxii., 315. (Bibliotheca Teubneriana). 1 Mk. 50.

RUEHL has collated the chief MSS. and gives in the preface the principal various readings and conjectures. Several scholars, as Baehrens, A. v. Gutschmid, Theod. Nöldeke, Edwin Rohde, L. Müller, and L. Jeep (not Justus Jeep, the editor of Teubner's former edition) have supplied corrections and rendered other help. Ruehl no longer scents so many glosses in the text, as he did in 1872, and gives a more conservative text than he would do, if he could have added a complete apparatus. The (historical) index is new.—J. E. B. M.

DECIMI MAGNI AUSONII BURDIGALENSIS opuscula. Recensuit RUDOLPHUS PEIPER. Lipsiae 1886 (Bibl. Teubneriana). pp. cxxviii 556. 6 M. 60 Pf.

THE works of Ausonius, with the exception of the Mosella, have been strangely neglected till of late. Haupt noticed a few of his quotations from classical poets, but most scholars for two centuries have treated him with silent contempt. Now we have two excellent editions, Schenkl's and Peiper's, appearing at an interval of three years.

The preface gives (1) an account of the MSS. pp. v—lxxxviii, and (2) a chronological table, followed by pedigrees and a supplement to the first index.

Before the publication of Schenkl's edition Peiper had treated at length of the manuscript evidence for the text of Ausonius ('Die handschriftliche Ueberlieferung des Ausonius' in Jahrb. f. class. Philologie, Suppl. xi 191–253, Leipz. 1879), and had proved that some 36 of the epigrams are the work of Italian scholars of the fifteenth century, and that several other pieces (periochae Homeri Iliadis et Odysseae, septem sapientum sententiae, de rosis, nomina Musarum, de signis caelestibus), though ancient, are ascribed to Ausonius without authority. Lexicographers and commentators should revise their works by the light of this discovery.

The more important parallels are cited under the text; others in ind. i 'auctores et imitatores' (pp. 437–499). The second index 'nominum et rerum'

¹ The author of the letter ascribed to Musonius.

² The author of the letter 'ad Zenam et Serenum.'

fills pp. 500–544. Ind. iii and iv give tables in which the pages and numbers of the new edition are compared with the Delphin, Bipont, and Schenkl's arrangements.—J. E. B. M.

M. Minucii Felicis Octavius. Emendavit et praefatus est AEMILIUS BÄHRENS. Lipsiae 1886, 1 M. 35 Pf. (Bibl. Teubneriana).

TO Augustine's City of God, Commodian, Dracontius, Eusebius (h.e., p.e., d.e.), the *Christus Patiens*, Iosephus, Iuvenius, Nonni paraphr., and the N.T. of Buttmann, the enterprising publisher here adds for the benefit of theological students what Halm calls the 'aureus libellus' of Minucius. The preface is dated Groningen, June 1883, but a postscript dated Nov. 1885 informs us that it was not sent to press for more than two years later. Bährens makes the author a contemporary of Hadrian and Fronto, born at Rome and there educated under Trajan. He holds that Ebert has demonstrated that Tertullian borrowed from Minucius, an opinion not so generally held now as two years ago, and defines the years A.D. 162, 163, as the date of the Octavius. With regard to the dogmatic convictions of the author Bährens says: 'sic igitur statuo, Minucium aliquatenus praecessisse Straussios nostros Renanosque.' A selection of emendations is given below the text.—J. E. B. M.

From Schola to Cathedral. By G. BALDWIN BROWN. D. Douglas: Edinburgh. 7s. 6d.

THE main contention of this learned and ingenious contribution to the history of Christian architecture admits of being briefly stated. The 'schola' or meeting-house of a trade or other guild or corporation suggested, thinks Professor Brown, the earliest form of the Christian church. This is a sense of the word which is not familiar to the student of classical Latin, though it is akin to a classical usage; but it is found in the Jurists and in inscriptions. Every one will acknowledge the force of the author's argument when he urges that a community which was often persecuted by the State, and commonly the object of popular suspicion or hatred, must have had its places of worship of a very humble kind, suited for concealment rather than display. In after days, when Constantine had given the imperial recognition to Christianity, the stately *basilica* would naturally be the model of the church, indeed, would often be converted to the purposes of the now established religion; but in earlier times we should expect to find buildings of a very different kind utilized and imitated. Professor Brown finds a significant illustration in an edict of Alexander Severus, in which that Emperor, a great patron of trade-associations, decides in favour of the Christian community a dispute relative to a piece of land between it and the *popinarii*, on the ground that 'it was better that God should be worshipped in that place in any sort of way than that it should be given over to tavern-keepers.' The Christians wanted the place, then, for purposes of worship; and it is at least a probable conclusion that 'whatever building they erected on the ground thus secured would have been considered a *schola*, and would have had the form and architectural character of those buildings.' Further we cannot follow Professor Brown, and indeed it would scarcely be possible to do so without the aid of illustrations. But we have fulfilled our object if we have commended his very interesting volume to the notice of our readers.

BLACK-EYED SUSAN.

Η ΜΕΑΑΝΟΣΣΟΣ ΣΟΥΣΑΝΝΑ.

1
All in the Downs the fleet was moored,
The streamers waving in the wind;
When black-eyed Susan came on board;
'Oh! where shall I my true love find?
'Tell me, ye jovial sailors, tell me true,
'Does my sweet William sail among your crew?'

2
William, who high upon the yard,
Rocked with the billows to and fro,
Soon as her well-known voice he heard
He sighed, and cast his eyes below.
The cords fly swiftly through his glowing hands
And, quick as lightning, on the deck he stands.

3
So the sweet lark, high poised in air,
Shuts close his pinions to his breast,
If chance his mate's shrill voice he hear,
And drops at once into his nest.
The noblest captain in the British fleet
Might envy William's lips those kisses sweet.

4
'O Susan, Susan, lovely dear,
'My vows shall ever true remain;
'Let me kiss off that falling tear;
'We only part to meet again.
'Change as ye list, ye winds; my heart shall be
'The faithful compass which still points to thee.

5
'Believe not what the landmen say
'Who tempt with doubt thy constant mind;
'They'll tell thee, sailors when away
'In every port a mistress find.
'Yes, yes, believe them when they tell thee so,
'For thou art with me wheresoe'er I go.

6
'If to far India's coast we sail
'Thy eyes are seen in diamonds bright;
'Thy breath in Afric's spicy gale,
'Thy skin in ivory so white.
'Thus every beauteous object that I view
'Wakes in my soul some charms of lovely Sue.

7
'Though battle call me from thine arms
'Let not my pretty Susan mourn.
'Though cannons roar, yet safe from harms
'William shall to his dear return.
'Love turns aside the balls that round me fly,
'Lest precious tears should fall from Susan's eye.'

8
The boatswain gave the dreadful word;
The sails their swelling bosom spread;
No longer must she stay aboard;
They kissed; she sighed; he hung his head.
Her lessening boat, unwilling, rows to land;
'Adieu!' she cries, and waves her lily hand.

1
ἐν νανστάθμοις ἔκειτο πᾶς νεῶν στόλος,
σημεῖα δ' ἀνέμοις εὐπνύοις ἐπείετο,
μελάνοσσος εἶτε παρθένος, νεανίων
ζητοῦσ' ὃν εἶχε φίλτατον, προσέκετο,
ναύταις δ' ἀνείπεν, ἱλαρὲ νανβατῶν ὄχλῳ,
ἢ Γουλιέλμος οὐμός ἐσθ' ὑμῖν πάρα;

2
ὁ δ' αὖ, κεραΐαις ὑψόσ' ἐγκαθήμενος,
πύοντο τιναχθεὶς ἄλλοσ' ἄλλοθεν σάλψι,
ὡς αὐτίκ' ἔγνω φίλτάτης κόρης ὅπα,
ἔρωτι πληγείς, ὄμματ' ἔρριψεν κάτω
σχοινία δ' ἄρ' ἄφνω διὰ χερῶν διέπτατο,
ἐπ' ἱκρίοις δ' ἔστηκεν ἀστραπῆς δίκην.

3
κορυθαλλὸς οὕτως ὑψύθεν τανύπτερος,
κορυθαλλίδος λεγείαν εἰ φωνῇ κλυῇ,
ἔγνωκε· συστειλάς δὲ πρὸς στέρον πτερὰ
εἰς τὴν κάτωθεν σπεύδεται ρεοσίαν.
ναύαρχος αὐτὸς τοῦ βρετανικοῦ στόλου
τοιαῦτ' ἂν ἦρπας' ἀσμενος φιλήματα.

4
Σούσανν' ἐμὴ, Σούσαννα, φίλτατον κάρα,
βέβαιος ἡμῇ πίστις αἰὲν ἐμμενεῖ
φέρ' ἐξαιλέψω χεῖλεσιν πτηνὸν δάκρυ.
ἀποίχομαι μὲν, νόστιμος δ' ἐλεύσομαι.
ἄνεμοι, μεταλλάσσεσθε· καρδία δ' ἐμὴ,
μαγνήτις οἷα, πρὸς σε, τὴν Ἀρκτον, ῥέπει.

5
οἴκοι μενόντων μὴ πύθῃ λόγους βροτῶν,
πίστιν θελόντων ψεύδεσιν διαστρέφειν,
ὡς ὤθεν ἀνδρῶν νανβατῶν, ὅτῃ χθονὸς
τύχῳσ', ἔρωτα καινὸν εὐρόντων ἀεί—
πιθοῦ μὲν οὖν σὺ ταῦτα προσποιουμένους,
σὺ γὰρ πάρει μοι πανταχὲ πλανωμένῳ.

6
τηλουργὸν εἰ γῆν Ἰνδικὴν προσπλεύσομαι,
λίθοι φαεινὰ σὼν ἔχουσ' ὅσων φάος
αἰραῖ τε λιθικάι σάισιν εἴξουσιν προαῖς,
ελέφας δὲ τὴν σῆν οὐ νενίκηκεν χροῖαν,
οὕτω δ', ὅσ' ἂν κάλλιστα προσβλέψω ποτέ,
μνήμη παρέσται ταῦτα Σουσάννης ἐμοί.

7
πολέμῳ δὲ σὼν περ φροῖδον ὠλενῶν ἀπο
μή μ' ἄντομαι δάκρυα, καλλίστη κόρη,
χάρμης γὰρ αὐτῆς ἐκ μέσων βροντημάτων
σωθεῖς, σὲ Γουλιέλμος ὀφεται πάλιν.
'Ἔρωσ γὰρ πάντοσ' ἀμφὶς ἐκτρέφει βέλη,
μὴ μαργαρίτιδ' ὅμμα σὸν στάξῃ μίαν.

8
νῦν δ' αὖ κελευστής πικρὸν ἐξείπεν λόγον·
ἄνεμοι δὲ πληροῦσ' ἱστιῶν κόλπους βαθεῖς.
οὐ δὲ μένει Σούσανναν· ἐν δ' ἀσπάσασιν
αὐτοῖς στενάζει· κλίνεται δ' ἀνὴρ κάρα,
ὡς δ', ἥσσον αἰεὶ, θνή· χρίμπτεται σκάφος,
χαίρειν κελεύει φίλτάτῃ τὸν φίλτατον,
ἀπαλοῖς δ' ὁμοίαις λειρίοις τείνει χέρας.

G. DENMAN, M.A.

Trin. Coll. Camb. Quondam Soc.

UNIVERSITY INTELLIGENCE.

OXFORD.

The Pitt-Rivers Anthropological Museum is now partly open, and Dr. Tylor, Reader in Anthropology, is able to use it in illustration of his lectures. Of the six delivered this term, the first dealt with the development of wind-instruments, the second with that of stringed instruments, and it was shown how the harp of ancient Egypt grew up, and how similar instruments may be found in various parts of the world. Then came the lectures on the developments of boats and ships from their main originals,—the hollowed log,—the raft,—and the Egyptian boat of bulrushes covered with bitumen. The first kind produced the Phœnician and classical ship of war; and it was pointed out that the trireme, developing into the mediæval galley and the man-of-war, seems now to be passing back into its original use as a ram. The fifth lecture was on spinning and weaving, and the sixth on the garments thus produced: the Greek chiton was displayed on a lay-figure, and shown to be nearly identical with the garb of modern Egyptian women. There was a full audience throughout,—though, as in all such lectures here, it chiefly consisted of ladies.

We are to discuss next term a proposal to establish

a school of Modern Languages; the subject is to be treated philologically, and nobody to be admitted to the examination who has not satisfied the Moderators in classics. 'English' is to mean 'Early English,' as in the case of the Professorship dealing with the subject.

Mr. E. Maunde Thompson, of the British Museum, will deliver a course of eight lectures on Latin Palæography next term, twice a week, probably at 5 p.m. The Regius Professor of Greek will lecture on the History of Greek Philosophy, from the Eleatics to Socrates; and the Professor of Latin on Latin Etymology, especially as bearing on words connected with Politics, Law, Morals, and Religion. Trinity College has elected, as its President, the Rev. H. G. Woods. Mr. Woods was educated at Lancing, and came up to Oxford in 1861 as Scholar of Corpus Christi College: he was placed in the first class in Classics by the Moderators in 1863, and by the Examiners in 1865: was elected fellow of Trinity in the latter year, and was Tutor from 1866 to 1879, and Bursar from 1869 to the present time, with a short interval. He was appointed classical Moderator in 1869, and Proctor in 1877.

CAMBRIDGE.

It appears from the speech of the retiring Vice-Chancellor and the report since issued by the Financial Board, that our chief difficulty just now is want of funds. The 1877 Commission proceeded on the assumption that the colleges would by this time have been enjoying increased revenues of £25,000. As a matter of fact, the total increment is about £4500. Fortunately the Hancock bequest allows £10,000 to be appropriated to the pressing needs of the library; but some enterprises supposed necessary to put the university in a state of moderate efficiency must needs be postponed. However a fee of £1 5s. has been imposed upon candidates for the additional subjects of the previous examination, that is, on all candidates for honours.

Professor Middleton has announced a class for the study of Roman Topography and Archaeology this Easter vacation at Rome. Dr. Reid has resigned the lectureship of Roman History as from midsummer next. Mr. Hadley (Pemb.), Mr. Tottenham (Joh.), Mr. Edwards (Sid.), Dr. Peile, Mr. J. Armitage Robinson (Chr.), and Mr. Goodhart (Trin.), have been appointed examiners in Part I. of the Classical Tripos. For Part II. the appointments are, in Sect. A, Mr. Moule (Corp.), and Mr. Verrall (Trin.); Sect. B, Mr. Archer Hind (Trin.), and Mr. Hicks (Trin.);

Sect. C, Dr. Reid and Mr. E. S. Thompson (Chr.); Sect. D, Prof. Middleton and Mr. Tilley (King's); Sect. E, Dr. Postgate and Mr. Neil (Pemb.)

That all energy is not consumed upon the monotonous round of lectures and examinations will be proved by the publications of the year. Mr. Verrall's *Septem* and Mr. Adam's *Apology* led the way. Mr. Roberts has his *Greek Inscriptions* nearly ready: an important work on Platonic philosophy by Dr. Jackson, and an edition of the *Timæus* by Mr. Archer Hind, are in the press. Perhaps also Mr. Frazer's translation of Pausanias may see the light this year.

An interesting conference has been held in the Senate House, to discuss the conditions of affiliating to the university the students attending its local lectures. The number of such students has doubled in the past seven years, and as the work has now gone on successfully for fourteen years, its opportune organisation under the affiliation scheme may, it is hoped, provide something of a higher education in a permanent form throughout the country. But a central fund is needed, and the syndicate propose to provide a nucleus by handing over their balance of £600, the profits on local examinations.

[For Scholarships see page 89.]

NOTES.

DEMOSTHENES, *Androt.* p. 606, § 44: ὁμῶν παρὰ τὰς εἰσφοράς τὰς ἀπὸ Ναυσινίκου, παρ' ἰσῶς τέλαντα τριακόσια ἢ μικρὰ πλείω, ἅλλειμα τέτταρα καὶ δέκα ἐστὶ τέλαντα, ὧν ἐπὶ οὗτος εἰσπράξεν, ἐγὼ δὲ τίθημι ἅπαντα.

From this passage Boeckh infers (*P. E.* bk. iv. c. vii. p. 517, Eng. Tr.) that a property-tax producing 300 talents was a tually levied in the archonship of

Nausinikos. Grote, however, (vii. p. 102 = ix. p. 333) thinks the words imply 'that a total sum of 300 talents, or thereabouts, had been levied (or called for) by all the various property-taxes imposed from the archonship of Nausinikos down to the date of the speech,' i.e. between B.C. 378 and 355. In this opinion he is followed by Kennedy, Whiston, and Mr. Wayte, so that his view may be regarded as the

prevailing English interpretation. Now in *Aphob.* i. p. 825, § 37 (εἰσφοράς δ' εἰσενενοχέαι λογίζονται δούσι δεούσας εἰκοσι μνᾶς) the amount paid by the guardians by way of property-tax during the ten years they administered the estate (B.C. 376—366) is stated at 18 minae. Demosthenes' τίμημα was 3 talents (*ib.* p. 816, § 9), so that the aggregate of taxation during this period was at the rate of 10 per cent. on the τίμημα. But the total 'rateable value' of Athens, to use a modern phrase, was about 6000 talents at this time; see *de Symmor.* p. 183, § 19, ἐπειδὴ τὸ τίμημα ἐστὶ τὸ τῆς χώρας ἑξακισχίλιον ταλάντων, cf. *ib.* p. 185, § 27. It follows, therefore, that the property-taxes between B.C. 376 and 366 produced, roughly speaking, 600 talents, and it is impossible that Demosthenes could have calculated the aggregate of the twenty-three years between B.C. 378 and 355 at 300 talents only. There is, moreover, positive evidence in the speech itself that an εἰκοστή, which, it should be remembered, would produce about 300 talents, was actually the tax which Androtion was employed to collect; see p. 617, § 77, οὐ γὰρ αὐτοὺς δεκατέοντες οὐδέ... διπλᾶς πράττοντες τὰς εἰσφοράς (cf. *Timocr.* p. 752, § 169) where Mr. Wayte's note is calculated to mislead, as implying that the property-tax was always an εἰκοστή, whereas of course the rate varied with the amount required from time to time. The main objection to Boeckh's view lies in ἀπό, for which Taylor proposed ἐπὶ, but cannot this mean 'the property-taxes produced from the year of Nausinik's,' the year being regarded as the origin or source of the revenue? Grote also lays stress on the plural number τὰς εἰσφοράς, but surely the plural may represent the sum total paid by various contributors as well as the amount of successive imposts.

A. C. PEARSON.

NOTES ON THE SCHOLIA OF THE PLUTUS.—(1) A simple change of διαντῆς to ξαντῆς makes sense of the hypothesis numbered IV. in Dübner and III. in Velsen: τελευταῖαν δὲ διδάξαι τὴν κομωδίαν ταύτην ἐπὶ τῷ ἰδίῳ νόμῳ, καὶ τὸν νῦν αὐτοῦ συστήσαι Ἀραρότα ξαντῆς τοῖς θεαταῖς βουλόμενος, τὰ ὑπόλοιπα δύο δὲ ἐκείνου καθέκιν, Κώκαλον καὶ Αἰολοσκόων. 'Desiring that this should be the last play which he exhibited in his own name, and wishing to introduce at once his son Araros to the frequenters of the theatre, he entered in the name of Araros his two remaining plays, the Cocalus and the Aeolicon.'

(2) l. 38, ἐκ τῶν στεμμάτων. The Ravenna MS. enables us to correct the scholion which appears in Dübner, p. 327b, ll. 4-9. Martin gives the Ravenna reading thus: ἐπεὶ οἱ μαντεύμενοι . γράφ. ἀνακοινώσκει πρὸς τὸν θεὸν τὰς πεύσεις ἐποιούντο γράφ. . . . κτ. . . τ. κατὰ πρόθεσιν α. . . . τοῖς κείμενοι στεφάνῳ τε ἀμφιέσσαντες ἀβρ. τῷ μαντίῳ . . . ο. δὲ ἐντυχὼν συμφωνῶν τοῖς προ. . . νομένοις τὴν ἀπο. ρ. . . . ἐπ. . . . ἐξ ἂν δυτο. δια τριπόδων ἐρίτ. It seems to me that this may best be restored as follows: ἐπεὶ οἱ μαντεύμενοι ἐγγράφῳ ἀνακοινώσκει πρὸς τὸν θεὸν τὰς πεύσεις ἐποιούντο γράφ. ἐν πυκτῇ τῇ κατὰ πρόθεσιν ἐν ἀδύτοις κείμενῳ, στεφάνῳ τε ἀμφιέσσαντες παρέδωκαν τῷ μαντιπόλῳ, οὗτος δὲ ἐντυχὼν σύμφωνον τοῖς προτεινομένοις τὴν ἀπόκρισιν ἐποιεῖτο 'ἐξ ἀδύτοις διὰ τριπόδων ἐρίτμον' [*Eq.* 1016]. 'For men who consulted an oracle inquired of the god by means of a communication in writing. Having written their questions on a tablet purposely placed in the shrine, and putting a wreath round the tablet they delivered it to the divining priest; and he read it, and in accordance with the questions proposed gave his answer "from the shrine by means of tripods revered."' If ἐν ἀδύτοις is rightly restored, it is certainly strange that V should have αὐτοῖς, which would suggest either that the scholion in V came from R,

or that the scholion in both cases was copied from the same MS., into R with more, into V with less care. Under the ἀβρ [ἀβρῶ] a verb is concealed, perhaps παρέδωκαν. V supplies the lost verb by χειροτόνου placed after μαντιπόλῳ. The variants τῇ μαντιπόλῳ and ἡ δὲ ἐντυχούσα are doubtless due to some one who wished to specialise the explanation to Delphi. Note the late sense of ἐντυχάνειν.

(3) l. 84, ὅστις ἔνεκε τῆς φειδωλίας οὐδένα εἰς προσέσθαι φυλακῆς ἔνεκεν τῶν χρημάτων καὶ γλίσχρου βίου (Dübner, p. 329a, 51-53. Martin, p. 6) purports to be a quotation from the Pelargi. I would suggest that ἔνεκε τῆς φειδωλίας is a gloss upon φυλακῆς ἔνεκεν, and that the lines ran perhaps thus

ὅστις οὐδέν' οἱ
εἰς προσέσθαι, [φασί,] φυλακῆς εἴνεκα,
ὧν χρημάτων [μάλιστα] καὶ γλίσχρος βίου,

'Who suffered no man, they say, to make up to him, for precaution's sake, being very grasping of money and substance.'—W. GUNION RUTHERFORD.

RUTILIUS CLAUDIUS NAMATIUS, II. 47, 8:

'Visceribus nudis armatum condidit hostem
Illatae claudis liberio dolo.'

THE subject to *condidit* is Stilicho, who admitted the Goths by compact into the 'viscera' of Latium. The second line stands as I have written it in all editions. It is interpreted thus: 'by a wile more free from danger than the wile of an openly inflicted disaster,' i.e. it was safer for Stilicho to use against his country the wile of a compact with the Goths than the wile of a direct attack. There is much difficulty here. The natural senses of *illatae claudis* and *liberio* are warped in a strange fashion; and an *illata clades* could not be called a *dolus*. Is it not obvious that in the line as Rutilius wrote it there was an allusion to the Trojan horse? There are similar mythological allusions in the context. *Illatae* is a blunder for *Iliacae*. Whether the error was in the lost codex, or in the transcript of a codex Bobiensis made by Inghirami in 1494, from which all existing MSS. are derived, is hard to say. If the commonly accepted idea be true that the codex was written in the Langobardic minuscule of the Carolingian epoch, the error was probably in the codex itself, since *Iliacae* in that particular script could hardly even by extreme negligence be mistaken for *illatae*. The word *liberio* has taken the place of some other comparative, which if the possibilities be considered can be no other than *deterio*. The Langobardic *d* has a long upstroke, and if the first part of the letter were faintly written or obliterated, it would easily be mistaken for *l*. The peculiar Langobardic *l* is not unlike some forms of the Italian *v* and *b*. Inghirami might therefore easily mistake *deterio* for *leverio* or *leberio*, which he would then naturally correct to *liberio*. The line '*Iliacae claudis deterio dolo*' will then mean 'by a wile more wicked than that which brought disaster on Troy.' For *dolus* compare Plautus, *Pseudolus* 1244, Fleck, 'superavit dolum Troianum atque Vlixem Pseudolus.'—J. S. R.

ON THE DERIVATION OF THE LATIN WORD 'TITULUS.'—So far as my research has gone, no derivation has yet been discovered for this word. *Ti*, followed by *t*, suggests reduplication; but the word, as it stands, seems to exclude any such view. *Ulus* suggests a diminutive; but *titulus* could only be 'little Titus,' which it certainly does not mean.

As to its meaning, Professor Skeat (under 'Title') explains *titulus* as 'superscription on a tomb or altar,'

referring to Gk. *τύπη*.¹ But it is not only 'on a tomb or altar,' but upon many other things, a banner, or a building of any kind, a *pittacium*, ticket, or docket of any sort, that a *titulus* may be written or graven; above all, it is used by the Romans, as *titulus* is by us, to describe a book or *volumen*, probably also any part of a book, and this use (there is no reason to doubt) was as early as any of its other uses.

In the course of last year, dipping into Rabelais (for the sake of his old French, not of his matter), I came across the phrase '*titre au dessus*,' the *titre* above (the heading of the page). How came this *l* into the word? I asked myself; and it occurred to me forthwith that it came from *stilus*; and if so, that *titulus* is a derivative of *stilus*. The more I have considered this matter, the more strong has become my conviction that this, and none other, is the origin of *titulus*,—the *stilus* above the *stilus*, that which is written above to explain that which stands below in a book. Thence it became a brief description generally, however and wherever written, however and wherever spoken as our dictionaries tell us.

Some friends have suggested that the *l* of *titulus* arises by metathesis from the *l* of *titulus*, and cite a Spanish word in which some such transposition occurs. I do not think the two cases alike: but this does not concern me much, for I do not adduce *titulus* as a proof, but only as that which brought *stilus* to my mind, and so induced the train of thought which led me to conviction.

There are two ways in which we may suppose *stilus* to produce *titulus*: in both we strike off *s* which is lost (as in *torus*, *taurus*, *tego*) by so many words about 100 in number, beginning with *s* and a second consonant. This leaves *tilus*; reduplication gives *titulus*, from which to *titulus* is only the same step as from *minimus* to *minumus*. This seems better than to imagine a diminutive ² *titulus* converted by assimilation (*l-t*) to *titulus*. That reduplication has sometimes a diminishing use, appears from such words as *cicindela*, *cincinnus*.

In any case I think that *titulus* is a derivative of *stilus*; and that, as *stilus* (the instrument of writing, *γραφεῖον*, graver or pen) was used by a metonymy, to express the matter written (whence in English, *style*), so *titulus* was first used to express the small matter, by which the greater was summarised, whether in a brief heading, or in any other descriptive form.

B. H. KENNEDY.

[The above note was submitted to two scholars who have made a special study of etymology. Their opinions are given below.]

Stilus, originally 'stake,' stands for *studus*, cf. Aeg. *studu* 'post,' and Eng. *stud*. The reduplicated form would be *stitulus*. Loss of initial *s* before *t* in Latin is allowed by Stolz in *tego tergo tono torus trio tundo turba turdus*, and by Brugmann himself in *tego* and *tundo*; *taurus* is less likely. Bugge's connexion of *titulus* with Eng. *stoop* is an exact parallel to that of *titulus* with *stilus*. The old *u* of *stilus* would be preserved in *titulus*, because the latter was taken as a diminutive. But does *stilus* ever mean 'the written matter'?—E. R. W.

¹ Since this was written I find that Professor Skeat has followed Corssen (*Krit. Brit.* 373), who refers not only *titulus*, but *linor*, to *τύπη*! This idea is justly set aside by Curtius (*Gr. Etym.* 481).

² I prefer the form diminutive.

It cannot be safely assumed that *s* was lost from initial *st* within the Latin language. Loss of *s* in (*s*)*tego* (and similar doublet forms in different languages) took place, not in Latin, but in Ind.-Eur. Otherwise we might get *titulus* from *sti-tel-us*, a reduplicated form from root *stel*; cf. *steti*, *spondi*, *seicidi* (the old form given by Priscian, I. vi. 30). But certain examples of such initial loss in Latin are not to hand.—J. P.

CAN there be any reason why Liddell and Scott (ed. 7) should assign to *ἐπισμαρτία* in Cic. *Att.* xiv. 3, 2, a different meaning ('suffrage, voting') from that which it has in Cic. *Att.* i. 16, 11, i.e. 'indications of feeling' in the way of applause, or hooting at the theatre?—A. S. WILKINS.

RECENT editors with one accord accept the conjecture of Salmasius in Plaut. *Mil. Gl.* 695, *toraria* for the vulgate *ceraria*, on the strength of a gloss in which it is found explained by *ἀλεστροφόρος*. One would like to find some passage in which *torus* is so far equivalent to *ἀλένη* as to lend any support to this identification. 'Muscle-woman' is not a natural expression for a nurse whose duty is to bear an infant in her arms. The reading of A. *certaria* does not favour the conjecture.—A. S. WILKINS.

THE MAUSOLEUM.—Claude Guichard's story of the destruction of the Mausoleum at Halicarnassos by the Knights of Rhodes is now well known from the reprints by Sainte Croix, Ross, Newton, Herquet, and others. It is briefly this. Just before the invasion of Rhodes by Sultan Sulaiman in 1522, some knights were sent over to put the castle at Halicarnassos into repair. In looking about for stone, they chanced on the pyramidal summit of the Mausoleum, and as they dug down, they discovered a cavernous entrance. Within there was a square chamber surrounded with sculpture in relief, and beyond it another chamber containing a tomb with a vase and an inscription. On returning next morning they found the tomb broken open, by corsairs as they thought, and fragments of gold scattered round. This is mainly a new version of the old story in Muhammad Abd Allah ibn Abd al-Hakim of the forcing of the Great Pyramid of Ghizeh by the Khalif al-Mamûn, Harûn ar-Raschid's son. Hewing a cavernous entrance in the side, the Arabs came to a chamber beyond which was another containing a tomb with a body wearing a golden breastplate; and there was also a vase and an inscription. Two additions have been made. First, the sculpture in relief, suggested by the slabs of the frieze built into the castle walls. Secondly, the intervention of the corsairs, suggested by the attack on the knights by the Seljûk lord of Mylasa during the building of the castle; as to which see Ducas. Guichard says he had the story from d'Alechains, who had it from de la Tourrette, one of the knights sent over to Halicarnassos in 1522. The remains of the Mausoleum had been used for the castle long before: Fontanus, who was judge of appeal at Rhodes in 1522, says this was done a century ago. Is it possible that the incredibly sagacious hounds which kept watch at Halicarnassos for the knights were really the marble lions from the Mausoleum built into the castle walls? The pilgrims who mention these hounds (Ghistele, Breydenbach, Tschudi, and others) had not seen them; but had merely heard of them at Rhodes, Halicarnassos lying off the pilgrims' track.—CECIL TORR.

REPORTS

ARCHAEOLOGY.

(Acquisitions of British Museum, continued from page 27.)

A SERIES OF PAINTED VASES OBTAINED BY MR. W. R. PATON IN THE ISLAND OF KALYMNOS.—In a recent letter to me Mr. Paton writes as follows: 'The vases, I am informed, were all found together at a site which has been pointed out to me, close to Pothia, the modern town on the hill which bounds the valley on the west.¹ They were found accidentally, and no further researches have been made there. I have been shown small vases of the same class (Bügelkanne), which have been found lower down the hill near the bed of the stream. I am assured that the two small cameos which I gave last year to the British Museum, and which I obtained from the same source, were found together with these vases. The former owner is quite positive on this point. Nothing else found together with them has been preserved. 'I am sorry I have no more precise information: it is now five or six years since the discovery took place, and no one paid much attention to it at the time.'

The 'two small cameos' to which Mr. Paton refers above are as follows: (1) Onyx cameo of two very thin layers, white on yellowish colour; a female figure advancing towards a male with lyre (?), taking him by the left shoulder and right arm; (2) Similar, a nude female (Europa ?) riding to right on bull (?), holding drapery which flies in crescent form over her head. As these are of distinctly late Greek, if not of Roman work, it was rather a shock to meet them in company with 'prehistoric' pottery and nothing else. But Mr. Paton in a subsequent letter (Feb. 2, 1887) tells me 'I discovered at Kalymnos that the two onyx cameos were found in the immediate neighbourhood of the vases, but not with them; which ends the difficulty.' For reasons which are furnished by the vases themselves I am inclined to think this series, excepting possibly the first six, are certainly the latest examples yet known of their class. The first six in my list given below are of lighter-coloured clay and more finished work, while the decorations are not different from the ordinary types of Ialysos. The remainder, however, have all the appearance of a degenerating style. Well-known forms are indeed suggested, but are either improved upon (as Nos. 8-9) or else conventionalised (as No. 15); in fact in No. 7 the decoration suggests nothing so much as the *banalité* of Cyprus. It is much to be regretted that we have not precise information as to the finding of this interesting series, as to the mode of sepulture, character and size of tomb, and as to other objects which the tomb or tombs may have contained: for I think they open up a new chapter in the history of pre-Hellenic pottery.

In the descriptions which follow, I have referred, wherever a comparison is possible, to the vases published in Furtwaengler and Loeschke, *Mykenische Vasen*, especially to the shapes given in plate xlv.

1. Bügelkanne (shape 51), brown bands on light drab; ht. 11½ in.

2. Bügelkanne (shape 51, but slopes straight from

shoulder to foot), on shoulder ornament exactly similar to that on No. 272; ht. 3¾ in.

3. Cup with two handles (shape 76); ornament very similar to No. 222, dark brown and drab; ht. 4 in. diam. 5½ in.

4. Cup, similar to preceding; ornament same as No. 242, light brown; ht. 4 in. diam. 5½ in.

5. Vase (shape 33); ornament like upper half of a leaf between two sets of vertical lines, bright red on drab; ht. 5½ in. diam. 6¾ in.

6. Similar vase; ornament in dark brown on drab; ht. 4 in. diam. 5½ in.

7. Large orange-shaped vase (similar to shape 27, but without lip and different handles); on shoulder four horizontal handles, two below, twisted, and pierced horizontally at points of insertion, and two halfway between on an upper level. The shoulder is divided into three friezes by parallel bands; in the top frieze sets of zigzags; in middle, sets of concentric half circles; in lowest, *obv.* two stags confronting stag and goat, in the middle, a palm-tree; *rev.* two stags confronting two stags, in middle, similar tree. The bodies of the animals have the outline filled in with dots, the necks, with hatched lines (quite unlike any type in *Myk. Vas.*; the animals in No. 416b are somewhat similar, but certainly earlier in style); ht. 21½ in.

8. Kalathos with two horizontal handles (new shape, the nearest is 78): on the exterior, plain bands, on interior, frieze of spiral patterns, brownish red on reddish ground: on the interior, at each point where the insertion of the handles comes, are three raised knobs, as if suggesting rivets; ht. 6 in. diam. 11 in.

9. Kalathos in every way similar to preceding, except the interior decoration, which consists of a frieze of two waterbirds, four dolphins, and a large floral ornament (cf. pl. v.); ht. 6 in. diam. 11½ in.

10. Beaker (shape 96), dark reddish brown with light band in centre; ht. 6 in. diam. 7 in.

11. Bügelkanne (shape 50), spout wanting; light red bands on body; on shoulder a frieze with a tongue-shaped ornament, a check pattern (cf. No. 341) and a scale pattern (cf. No. 333); all light red on reddish ground; ht. 6½ in.

12. Ditto (same shape and colours), palmette, and spiral band (cf. No. 131); ht. 5½ in.

13. Ditto, Ditto, leaf pattern; ht. 4 in.

14. Cup (shape 87), broad wavy line round body; ht. 3 in. diam. 5½ in.

15. Cup (shape 80) very heavy coarse red pottery; ht. 5 in. diam. 6½ in.

16. Cup (shape 84); on *obv.* conventionalised cuttlefish red on reddish yellow; the *rev.* is undecorated; ht. 7½ in.

17. Amphora (shape 43), black wavy lines and handles each terminating in three downward stripes; ht. 13 in.

18. Amphora (shape 37), similar decoration; ht. 10½ in.

19. Kernos of four vases (shape 33), conjoined with large arching handle, broken (shape 117); decoration dark brown or light unglazed red; beneath

¹ See Newton, *Travels*, i. p. 235, who, speaking of Kalymnos, says, 'the modern harbour, now called Pothia, on the eastern coast.' In Ross, *Reisen*, ii. this is marked on his map, simply as 'Hafen,' and the town on the hill as 'Stadt.'

base of each vase are sets of diagonal lines; ht. $2\frac{1}{2}$ in.

20. Simpulum (shape 102 without foot), coarse red clay; ht. $4\frac{1}{2}$ in.

A SERIES OF ANTIQUITIES FOUND TOGETHER IN A TOMB NEAR SESTO CALENDE, LAGO MAGGIORE.

Vase of black ware (bucchero), ornamented with incised patterns and containing ashes.

Cup on tall foot, plain (bucchero).

Aryballos, plain (bucchero).

Two bronze fibulae, part of a large armilla and of a bronze chain.

(To be continued.)

ANTIOCH.—In the *Times* of January 3 Mr. Greville Chester called attention to the destruction of ancient remains at Antioch. We have reason to believe that the worst injuries were inflicted in the time of Ibrahim Pasha of Egypt; and that, partly in consequence of Mr. Chester's letter, the Turkish authorities will in future exercise a benevolent supervision in these matters.—[C. S.]

EXCAVATIONS AT ASSARLIK.—I have received a very important series of notes from Mr. W. R. Paton of excavations and researches which he has been for some time carrying on in the neighbourhood of Myndus on the coast of Caria. These notes will shortly be published in full, together with the necessary illustrations, in the *Hellenic Journal*, but meanwhile I should like to take the earliest opportunity of indicating briefly the general scope of these discoveries, which throw a very important new light on the increasingly interesting question of the pre-Hellenic races of Asia Minor.

Mr. Newton (*Hist. Disc.* pp. 580 sq.) mentions a series of tombs close by the Akropolis of Assarlik, which he identified with the ancient Souagela; Mr. Paton, however, adduces reasons to show that Assarlik is probably a minor site in the district of Termera (Chifoot Kale), rather than that of Souagela, the importance of which we know from the Athenian tribute lists.¹

Near this site Mr. Paton opened a quantity of tombs, upon a ridge facing the Akropolis to the south-east, the contents of some of which are now in the British Museum. These tombs were of two kinds, viz.:

(i.) A circular wall of polygonal masonry, about thirty feet in diameter, on which are piled loose stones forming the tumulus: in the centre a sepulchral chamber closed at top by two large stones, and entered by dromos to north-west, roofed with large rectangular stones and with walls of polygonal masonry: the door is formed of a rectangular block as lintel resting on two others as sideposts.

(ii.) A rectangular enclosure formed by a single course of polygonal masonry, with no trace of a tomb, but occasionally enclosing a small superficial cavity lined with four slabs of terra-cotta, and covered with a large circular stone; containing only ashes. Lower down the hill these characteristics interchange; some rectangles having large sepulchres which have contained a sarcophagus or a *pinthos*, the few circles containing only small *ostothekai*.

Mr. Paton thinks these tombs on or near high summits are those which Strabo says were pointed out in Caria as the work of the Leleges (see Newton, *loc. cit.*). 'The same mode of burial in combination with geometric designs is found in Italian tombs of

¹ Mr. Newton, who has read Mr. Paton's arguments, points out, *per contra*, the striking importance of the position of Assarlik from a strategical point of view.

the early iron age (*Bullet. ser. Romana*, i. p. 158) and possibly elsewhere. I should think that the Leleges were primitive inhabitants both in Greece and Asia Minor, and that they did not emigrate from the latter through the islands. There is no evidence that they were a seafaring people like the Carians. The two undoubtedly Lelegian towns of Pedasus are both inland, and if we can dismiss the Cretan account given by Herodotus, there is no trace of them in the islands except Chios and Samos. The island tombs seem to belong to quite a different people. The tumuli at old Smyrna, which I have not yet visited, seem to resemble in construction those of Assarlik. Perhaps they are tombs of the same people, as Strabo mentions Leleges in the neighbourhood of Smyrna.

It seems probable that the Assarlik system of sepulchral architecture survived long among these people, for on a ridge near the village of Gheresi Mr. Paton saw two tombs of this style, of which the entrances lead out of a semicircular wall built into the face of the hill looking west: here he found many fragments of black and red glazed pottery. On the adjoining summit is a very remarkable tomb, surrounded at a distance of about eight metres by a wall, and roofed by five enormous stones. The whole is encircled by a second wall, distant twenty-four metres down hill; and opposite the entrance of the tomb is a gate. In it were some fragments of marble which had possibly formed part of a door or of a sarcophagus, and a small fragment of an Attic vase of the fifth century. 'I should be inclined to think from its magnificence and conspicuous position it was a tomb of one of those Karian princes mentioned in the Athenian tribute lists. At any rate it is much later than the tumuli of Assarlik.'

Mr. Paton deduces the following results from the objects which he has found, and which are now in the British Museum:—

I. No trace of any but geometric design.

(i.) All vases which have painted decorations have horizontal bands alone or in combination with large concentric circles or segments of circles (except one with zigzag pattern).

(ii.) Impressed patterns on larger vessels zigzag or wavy.

(iii.) Same system on gold.

II. Forms of vases have little in common with Mycenaean, and have not the variety of that class.

III. The fibulae are all of one pattern.

IV. Weapons all iron.

V. Bodies in all cases burnt.

Of the class of objects which Mr. Paton found, a sufficient idea will be given by quoting here the contents of two tombs. In the first were:—

A. (i.) A large amphora, nearly circular, with nearly vertical handles, filled with bones and ashes.

(ii.) A bowl with two handles, plain drab.

(iii.) A jug, plain drab.

(iv.) An amphora with patterns of concentric circles.

(v.) Fragments of iron weapons, including a lance head and a curved knife.

In the second were:—

B. (i.) A cinerary vase as in A.

(ii.) Fragments of a thin curved plate of bronze, which has been attached to wood.

(iii.) Two gold spirals (for the hair?).

(iv.) Fragments of iron weapons.

Among the other objects from these tombs may specially be noted:—(i.) An elektron circular bulla (2 in. diam.), the upper part curled over for attachment, and with holes for attachment all round the

edge, which is recurved; with a circular boss *repoussé* in the centre, and patterns of triangles filled with stippled dots. (iii.) A bandeau of gold plate, 3 in. by 1½ in., with double row of zigzags; cf. *Arch. Zeit.* 1884, Taf. 9, 4. (iii.) Several bronze fibulae of form similar to *ibid.* Taf. 9, 3, without the side plate. (iv.) A series of fragments of terra-cotta sarcophagi with incised and stamped designs.

The importance of these discoveries cannot be over-estimated in their bearing on the early history of the 'Geometric' races; everything goes to prove that the products of the Assarlik graves are exclusively local; clay, bronze (or copper), iron, and gold, that is all, and the only decoration, as Mr. Paton remarks, is geometric; while the vases are all wheel-made, they are as a rule coarse in texture, and of the simplest forms,¹ and being insufficiently baked have unfortunately lost much of the surface. No idols, nor any traces of representation of human or even of animal figures, if we except the askos. Nothing which can be considered as imported; the whole series, in fact, seems to speak of an inland folk of a very archaic period, subject to little outside influence, but with a fairly advanced culture, if we may judge from the beautifully-worked fibulae. They add one more link to the connexion between the early Italian sites and the inland sites of Lydia and Caria. The rich series of patterns on the fragments of Mr. Paton's sarcophagi compare with nothing so well as the archaic Corneto find in *Mon. Ined.* X. x.²; and Furtwaengler has pointed out, *loc. cit.* p. 99, that the geometric gold bandeaux show a strong similarity with the impressed reliefs on Rhodian pithi, and so with the impressed reliefs on the Bucchero vases of Italy. There is yet one more point of connexion. The only pottery which I know of as resembling the Assarlik vases is a series of fragments in the British Museum from Sardes. In 1869 Mr. Dennis made a tentative excavation at Bintepe ('thousand hills'); he succeeded in finding one of these tumuli in an apparently intact state, but before he could succeed in penetrating through the solid core of masonry in the interior of the tumulus he was compelled for want of funds to bring his operations to a close: the fragments of vases which we now possess were the only fruits of his expedition. In the Berlin *Abhandl.* for 1858, p. 539, v. Ofiers describes a thorough exploration of one of these Grabhügel by Herr Spiegelthal. The tomb he found is certainly of later date than those of Assarlik, but a distinct development of the same system. The one Dennis attacked was apparently an earlier one of the same series, and the fragments from it bear a marked similarity to the Assarlik series. If the early sites of Lydia and Caria could be more fully explored, we should probably be in a better position to judge of the early history of the Italian races.

CECIL SMITH.

DELPHI.—Ever since 1862, when Foucart and Wescher continued on a larger scale the excavations begun at Delphi by C. O. Müller, it has been understood that the complete excavation of the site would some day be undertaken by France. In 1880 M. Haussoullier continued the work, and found, besides hundreds of inscriptions belonging to the inscribed wall of the peribolos, the now celebrated portico of the fifth century (de quo vide *Bull. Corr. Hellén.*) The difficulties which stood in the way of more systematic

¹ With two exceptions, viz. (i.) A bügelkänn, decorated with segments of concentric circles: the spout is joined at the top to the handle, and at the insertion of the outer part of the handle a hole is pierced. (ii.) A bird-shaped askos, very similar to the horse-shaped one in *Mon. Ined.* X. x., with decorations of spirals.

² Cf. also the description of the Vetulonia "tomb of the warrior" quoted in the *American Journal*, 1886, p. 492.

excavations were: 1. the necessity of expropriating the modern village of Castri, which is built on the ruins of the Delphian temple; 2. a certain reluctance of the Greeks, which already expressed itself in 1875, when the Germans asked their permission for digging at Olympia.

Now, the chief obstacles have been removed. An agreement between prime minister Tricoupis and the French minister Count Montholon, has been established on the terms of the permission granted to the Germans in 1875, viz. that all the discoveries are to remain in Greece, and the French school at Athens, entrusted with the diggings, is to possess during five years the exclusive right of publishing, taking casts, &c. A law will be presented by M. Tricoupis to the Greek parliament in order to insure the removal of the small houses which compose the village of Castri. The excavations will begin as soon as possible. It is understood that they will be conducted by M. Foucart, director of the school, with M. Haussoullier as chief assistant, and the other members of the school as overseers. —SALOMON REINACH.

NISYROS.—In the *Ἀνακτορία* (Smyrna) of January 21, and also in the *Ἐφημερίς* (Athens) of January 20, is published a marble inscription recently found in this island. It is an honorary decree, of which seventeen lines are preserved, recording the name of a certain Gnomagoras, son of Dorotheos a Nisyrion, the various services he had rendered to the island, and the honours which had been conferred on him by the *βουλὴ* and the various *κοινὴ*. It is specially mentioned that he had seen service in a light cruiser named 'Ἐκαστρία Σεβαστή,' and that in his capacity of gymnasiarch he had furnished oil at his own cost to all those who took part in the games. —[C. S.]

PATMOS.—In *Blackwood*, March 1887, Mr. J. T. Bent describes a visit to this island. He gives an interesting account of some of the more noteworthy books in the monastery, and of some curious customs which still survive among the Patmotes, especially noticing the veneration with which the cave of St. John is still regarded. —[C. S.]

FURNI.—In *Longman's Magazine*, March 1887, Mr. J. T. Bent describes four islets near Samos, named as he thinks after certain rock-cut tombs. Unfortunately his archaeological researches here last year were cut short by the arrival of a pirate caïque, whose evil intentions were with difficulty frustrated. —[C. S.]

SMYRNA.—I recently visited the Necropolis of Old Smyrna, and noticed that all the tombs on the lower slopes of the hill had been in recent years opened by treasure-grubbers. These tombs are sunk perpendicularly in the ground, and are without entrances, but so far imitate the more ancient tumuli higher up in the neighbourhood of the so-called tomb of Tantalus that they are surrounded by stone circles. Numerous fragments of pithoi and terra-cotta sarcophagi were lying about. I picked up one small portion of the rim of a sarcophagus, which is ornamented in the same way as those from Clazomenae. It has a guilloche pattern with a double fringe of palmettes. Where the guilloche terminates is a double row of squares, running across the rim. There is a precisely similar fragment from Clazomenae in the museum at Smyrna, which shows that this chequer pattern, like the maeander on another sarcophagus (*Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1883, p. 10) separates the figure paintings from the remaining portion of the rim. The traces of colour are bright red and white, the red being laid on the top of the white.

It is much to be desired that some attempt should be made to find and preserve other such sarcophagi which may yet exist.

Remains of early Greek art from this site would have a peculiar value, as they must date from before the Lydian conquest.—W. R. PATON.

VOLO.—The following statement, of which the archaeology appears somewhat hazy, is taken from the *Evening Standard*, March 11 :—"The excavations that are being made in the prehistoric tombs here

have resulted in several very interesting discoveries. A considerable number of small *objets d'art* in gold and porcelain, probably of Egyptian origin, have been found. It is conjectured that the bodies of the dead were burned with their ornaments, except certain of the more valuable articles, which were afterwards placed in the tomb. Round one of the tombs is a seat, and the bricks of which this is constructed have evidently been burned, a point of some interest in the history of architecture."—[C. S.]

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the EDITOR of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—I cannot expect that you will allow me space to examine in detail Mr. Sidgwick's extraordinary travesty of the *Quarterly* scheme for a School of English Literature which appeared in your last number, but I trust you will permit me to correct two or three of his most glaring mis-statements, and to repudiate the nonsense which he has so unfairly attributed to me.

1. He ridicules my excluding from the curriculum of literary study all Cicero's treatises, all the Platonic Dialogues and the *Republic*, while including such trash as the *Hymnus Sejunctivum* of Prudentius. A reference to the *Quarterly* (p. 261) will show that the *De Oratore* and the *Brutus* are among the books expressly prescribed as text-books; that so far from the *Republic* being excluded it is expressly stated that no student should be admitted to an honour degree in arts who had not an adequate acquaintance with it (*Quarterly*, p. 259), and that so far from all the Platonic Dialogues being excluded, the *Phaedrus* and the *Phaedo*, described as works absolutely indispensable to the student of poetry, have a foremost place in the proposed curriculum. As for the introduction of the *Hymnus Sejunctivum* it is a pure fiction of Mr. Sidgwick's imagination. Mr. Sidgwick is much too well-read a scholar not to know that when Prudentius is alluded to, he is alluded to not as the author of the *Hymnus Sejunctivum*, but as the author of the *Psychomachia*, of the historical interest of which as a link between classical and modern literature Mr. Sidgwick must be perfectly aware.

2. Mr. Sidgwick twice ridicules my including *Silius Italicus* among the books proposed for the curriculum of study. I never even alluded to *Silius Italicus*. Nor is there anything in my article which could by any possibility be twisted into an allusion to him. The assertion is a pure invention of Mr. Sidgwick's.

3. I am accused of the absurdity of including in the proposed curriculum "the 1,400 pages of the *Corpus Poetarum*," and "some at least of the Alexandrine didactics." This also is pure fiction. Of the poets comprised in the *Corpus Poetarum* I never suggested that any but the leading and master classics should be read except in extracts, and these extracts taken in their entirety, amounted only to a few hundred lines. To the "Alexandrine didactics" I made no reference at all.

4. Mr. Sidgwick asserts that the scheme which he criticises would exclude from a school of *Belles Lettres* the writings of Wycliffe, Malory, More, Ascham, Sidney, Hooker, Bacon, Burton, Milton's prose works, Hobbes, Locke, much of Taylor, Barrow, South, Bunyan, Addison, Swift, &c. &c. He might have observed with equal reason that as the letters of the alphabet were not specified in the scheme they also would be excluded. If Mr. Sidgwick will turn again to the *Quarterly* article he will see that the history of English Literature forms as important a part of the proposed course as the critical study of prescribed works.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,
J. C. COLLINS.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Athenaeum: 29 Jan.: Rev. J. Welldon's *Rhetoric of Aristotle*. 12 Feb.: Jebb's *Homer*. 26 Feb.: excellent review (continued in next number) of the English translation of Mommsen's *Roman History*, vol. v., and review of S. S. Laurie's *Lectures on the Rise and Early Constitution of Universities*. 12 Mar.: review of B. V. Head's *Historia Nummorum*. 19 Mar.: Paley's *Gospel of St. John*; a *Verbatim Translation of the Vatican MS.*

Academy: 22 Jan.: Notices. Glazebrook's *Medea*; Sidgwick's *Greek Prose Composition*; and other school-books; two books on *Modern Latin Verse*, (R. Ellis); Schröder's *Linguistisch-historische Forschungen zur Handelsgeschichte und Warenkunde* Pt. 1; A. F. Pott's *Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft*, and Karl Abel's *Aegyptische Sprachstudien*. 29 Jan.: Beloch's *Die Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt*, (F. T. Richards); Leaf's *Iliad*, 1-12, (F. Havetfield). 5 Feb.: G. T. Stokes' *Ireland and the Celtic Church to the English*

Conquest in 1172, (R. Dunlop); W. Cunningham's *St. Austin*; V. H. Stanton's *Jewish and Christian Messiah*; two editions of Juvenal (A. S. Wilkins). Feb. 12: E. Vischer's *Offenbarung Johannis*, (R. B. Drummond); Mommsen's *History of Rome. The Provinces*, trans. by W. P. Dickson; Arnold's *Second Punic War*, edited by W. T. Arnold; Bouché-Leclercq's *Manuel des Institutions Romaines*; E. Morlot's *Précis des Institutions politiques de Rome*; P. Willems' *Les Elections Municipales à Pompéi*; W. Soltau's *Prolegomena zu einer Könischen Chronologie*; Duruy's *History of Rome*; Correspondence on the *Date and History of the Latin Bible of Monte Amiata*, by the Bishop of Salisbury; (19 Feb.) W. Sanday, *Martin Rule*; (26 Feb.) F. J. A. Hort, *Bishop of Salisbury*, H. J. White, *Martin Rule*. Feb. 19: Brugmann's *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, by A. H. Sayce. Feb. 26: Duncker's *History of Greece*, vol. ii. (F. T. Richards); Quicherat's *Mélanges d'Archéologie*

logie et d'Histoire, (J. H. Middleton). [*Codex Amiatinus*: The main points in this interesting correspondence are as follows: The generally-received account of the *Codex Amiatinus* at Florence, one of the chief authorities for the text of Jerome's *Vulgate*, was that it was written by a certain Servandus, whose name appears at the beginning of Leviticus, and who was identified with a deacon of that name who visited Benedict at Monte Casino in 541. On the back of fol. 1 is an inscription in Latin verse recording the gift of the *Codex* to the convent of Monte Amiata by Peter, abbot of a Lombard monastery. Some words in this inscription had been erased and altered. Last year De Rossi suggested that the *Codex* was that which Bede tells us Ceolfrid took with him from England as an offering to the Church of Rome in the year 716, and conjectured that one of the altered lines, now beginning *Lan-gobardorum*, had originally begun *Ceolfridus Britonum*. Accordingly he made the age of the *Codex* 150 years later than had been supposed. The Bishop of Salisbury, to whom we are indebted for this information, also mentions that Dr. Peter Corsen had pointed out certain resemblances between the *Cod. Am.* and the Bible given by Cassiodorus to the monastery of Vivarium which was written about 541.

Dr. Hort discovers, in an anonymous life of Ceolfrid from which Bede took his account, a description of the Bible taken to Rome in 716, giving the Latin inscription in its original form. The true reading of the line emended by De Rossi turns out to be *Ceolfridus Anglorum*. It further states that Ceolfrid had brought from Rome in an earlier visit a Latin Bible of the prae-hieronymian translation, and that he had three copies made in England of the new translation, one of which he took back as an offering to the Church of Rome. Dr. Hort further proves by quotations from some of Bede's smaller works that the old Bible brought from Rome was a copy of that of Cassiodorus, and thinks that the Servandus mentioned may have been the writer of the original from which the *Cod. Am.* was copied. Canon Raine suggests that Bede himself may have been the copyist, as there is a MS. of Cassiodorus *super Psalterium* in the Durham Library, which is said to be *de manu Bedae*.]

Expositor, March, 1887. Prof. A. B. Davidson has an interesting paper on the stand-point of the prophet Amos. Prof. Strack writing on Bible Revision in Germany mentions the strong feeling against any but the mildest revision of Luther's Bible, and gives a list of the chief critiques of the *Protebibel* up to the present time. The revision of the Old Testament seems to have been much bolder than that of the New Testament, the number of 'real alterations' being eighty for the latter and 3,000 for the former, besides 1,000 for the Apocrypha. The great fault of the revision is that the text used for the New Testament is the Erasmus of 1519; but complaint is also made of the style of the translation on the ground of inelegance and unintelligibility. The reviewer, however, commends the work on the whole, and hopes that the revisers will not be deterred from making further improvements by the outcry which has been raised against them. There are also papers by Sir J. W. Dawson on the Rivers of Eden, and by Prof. Rendel Harris on Dr. Sanday's view of the origin of the Christian Ministry.

The following articles on classical subjects have appeared in other magazines:—

Blackwood (March): Revelations from Patmos, by J. T. Bent. *English Historical Review* (Jan.):

The Empress Theodora, by C. E. Mallet, pp. 1-20; The Roman Province of Dacia, by T. Hodgkin; Lycurgus, the Legislator, by J. Adams. *Journal of Education* (Feb.): Rev. of Jevons' History of Greek Literature. (March): G. G. Ramsay's Selections from Tibullus and Propertius. *Nineteenth Century* (March): The Greater Gods of Olympus; I. Poseidon, by W. E. Gladstone. *The Quarterly* (No. 327): Naucratis and the Greeks in Egypt. *Scottish Review* (Jan.): Byzantinism and Hellenism, by D. Bikelas. *Scribner's Magazine* (Feb.): The Likenesses of Julius Caesar, by J. C. Ropes.

The *Church Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1887. An article on 'Egyptian Christianity' shows from Mr. Le Page Renouf's Hibbert Lecture that the Egyptian religion known to Greek and Latin writers was a late and corrupt stage of a much higher form which was monotheistic, and that the language expressive of this early belief survived side by side with the practice of polytheism. — 'The early History of Oxford' gives some insight into the intellectual condition of that university in distant times. Mr. Fletcher's 'Collectanea,' among other documents, contains the 'Day-Book of John Dorne, Bookseller' in 1520, by which we learn that very few books were required for the schools; the new Latin translation of Aristotle was supplanting the old thirteenth century versions, and the school grammars of Erasmus, Stanbridge, and Whittington, had eclipsed Priscian and Alexander de Villa Dei. The development of the university itself and its intellectual progress can now be followed pretty accurately by a study of the *Register*, edited by Mr. Boase, and the *Histories* of Mr. Parker, Mr. Maxwell Lyte, and Dr. Brodrick, the Warden of Merton College.—Among the shorter notices is one calling attention to the issue of the final volume of the English translation of Ewald's great work, *The History of Israel*, which is of great value as containing a copious index to the whole series. The translation is by Mr. J. F. Smith.

Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft, herausg. von IWAN MÜLLER. 14th series. 1886. no. 1-3.

Vol. xlvii. pp. 1-80. 1. On the literature of the Attic orators during the years 1882-1885, by G. Hüttner. The reviewer notices 77 books, pamphlets or articles; 13 of a general nature, 12 on Antiphon, 14 on Lysias, 21 on Isocrates, 13 on Isaeus; specially commending Br. Keil's *Analecta Isocratea* and some grammatical pamphlets, C. Bohlmann and E. R. Schulze on attraction; S. Keck on the dual in the orators with reference to the Attic inscriptions; H. Gölkel on the syntax of the verb and construction of sentences in Antiphon. He is inclined, with Grosse, to suspect the *Trapeziticus* attributed to Isocrates. Amongst the editions reviewed are Hickie's Andocides *De Mysteriorum*, Shuckburgh's Lysias, Herwerden's Antiphon, Kocks' Selections from Lysias (5 speeches) in the Bibliotheca Gothana; also a second edition of Froberger's Selections from Lysias by Gebauer, and the fifth edition of Isocrates' Panegyricus and Areopagiticus re-edited by Reinhardt. 2. On the Greek lyric and bucolic poets, excluding Pindar, by E. Hiller. A careful record of the emendations and suggestions proposed in pamphlets or articles of the years 1884 and 1885. Of the few dissertations not dealing directly with the text R. Holsten *De Stesichori et Ibyci dialecto et copia verborum* receives a long notice.

Vol. xlviii. pp. 1-48. Plantus from 1882-3 to 1885 by O. Seyffert. Under (1) a historical section, nineteen books or articles are noticed, many of great

value: as O. Ribbeck *Kolar*, A. Spengel on the headings and divisions of scenes in Latin comedy, E. Leidlolph *De Festi et Pauli locis Plautinis*, E. A. Sonnenschein *Bentley's Plautine Emendations*, C. R. Opitz on Latin acrostics. (2) Prosody and metre is the subject of the next section, which deals with important papers by W. Meyer, Bücheler, and Leo; also with dissertations and articles of A. Luchs, P. Schrader, J. H. Onions, and E. Below. (3) Under the next, or grammatical and linguistic section, Abraham's *Studia Plautina* and L. Buchhold *De paronomaseos (alliterationis) usu* are the most important works treated: but the review will be continued in the next number.

Vol. xlviii. pp. 1-160.

1. Latin Lexicography from July 1, 1884 to June 30, 1886 by K. E. Georges. The reviewer notices the new *Archiv für Lexicographie*, a publication started by the Bavarian Academy in preparation for a future 'Thesaurus Latine linguae'; Heerdeggen, Stolz, and Schmalz in Iwan Müller's Handbuch, vol. ii.; and lexicons to Caesar by Merguet, Menge-Prouss and Meusel, all in course of publication, of which the last is by far the best. He denounces G. A. Saalfeld's *Tensaurus Italo-Graecus* as plagiarised from the reviewer's own Latin dictionary, filling five pages with borrowed Latin words which Saalfeld ought to have included, if he had devoted independent study to his task. The review is wonderfully thorough and minute; in all 45 publications are noticed, and in many of them the reviewer corrects misprints and wrong references. 2. Works dealing with Greek and Roman metre of the years 1883-1885 are reviewed at length by R. Klotz. In all 139 publications are classed under eight heads: the history of metrical theory (including Westphal's *Rhythmik* and translation of Aristoxenus), metre and prosody in general, the Greek epos, Greek lyric poetry, the Greek drama, the Saturnian verse, the Roman drama, and Roman lyric and epic poetry. Besides the comprehensive works of Gleditsch, L. Müller, Zambaldi, most attention is bestowed on W. Meyer's paper on the history of the hexameter, Tichelmann *De versibus Ionicis a minore*, M. Schmidt on the structure of Pindar's strophes, a number of papers by F. Hansen (on the avoidance of the accent in the last syllable of a pentameter, &c.), N. Wecklein on the technique and delivery of the Aeschylean choral odes, the reviewer's own *Studia Aeschylea*, Giltbauer's *Philologische Streifzüge*, H. Zieliński on the metrical arrangement of the parts in old Attic comedy, a series of papers on the Saturnian verse from O. Keller down to L. Müller *Der saturnische Vers und seine Denkmäler*, E. Trampe on the metre of Lucan, F. O. Stange on that of Martinius Capella. The papers of W. Meyer, Leo, Bücheler noticed by the reviewer of Plautus in vol. xlvii. are exhaustively analysed here, and a note at the end reviews an article by Blass and a book by Wilamowitz on Isyllus of Epidauros, the author of five poems inscribed in the temple of Asclepius, which were discovered and published by Kabbadias in 1885. One of these poems is a paean in ionic metre, and the discovery naturally leads to renewed investigations as to the *versus ionicus* found in the lyric poets and the Attic drama.

Zeitschrift f. österr. Gymnasien xxxviii (1887) Heft 1. Wien, Gerold. *Kritisch-exegetischer Beitrag zu Porcius Licinius und Quintus Catullus*. Von F. Maixner.—*Ein Trojanerlied aus dem Mittelalter*. Von J. Huemer in Wien.—Reviews: 1. *Die homerischen Hymnen*. Hrsg. u. erl. von Dr. A. Gemoll. 8vo. Leipzig, Teubner, 1886, pp. xiv 378. 6 M. 80 Pf. Rev. by E. Abel. Abel, himself the editor of the

Homeric hymns, epigrams and Batrachomyomachia in Schenkl's bibliotheca, points out many inaccuracies in the critical and exegetical notes, but ends with the testimony that Gemoll's commentary, 'eine sehr anerkennenswerte, durchaus selbständige Leistung ist, welche berufen ist, dem Studium der homerischen Hymnen neuen, kräftigen Impuls zu verleihen.' 2. *Herodotos*. von Dr. J. Sitzler. vii Buch. 1 Abth. Text pp. vi 82. 2 Abth. Commentar. 8vo. Gotha, Perthes. 1885. 2 M. Rev. by J. Golling. Belongs to the 'Bibliotheca Gothana': better suited to schools than the commentaries of Stein and Abicht.—3. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Cato maior*. Laelius. Scholarum in usum edidit Th. Schiche. Pragae, Tempsky. 1884. Rev. by A. Kornitzer. The author, known by his 'Jahresberichte' on Cicero's philosophical works (in the *Ztschr. f. d. Gr.*), finds his text mainly on that of C. F. W. Müller, but exercises everywhere an independent judgement.—4. Three reviews by A. Zingerle. A. *Prolegomena in T. Livii librum xxxiii*. Ser. Andr. Frigell. pp. 72. Gotha, Perthes. 1885. The author has published prolegomena and epilogomena to other books of Livy. They contain statements, brought up to date, respecting the readings of MSS. and editions, with independent comments and emendations. B. *Titi Livi ab urbe condita liber IV*. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von Franz Luterbacher. pp. 116. Leipzig, Teubner. 1886. Valuable both for text and commentary. C. *M. Valerii Martialis epigrammaton libri*. Recognovit Walth. Gilbert. pp. xxxiii + 408. Lipsiae in aedibus Teubneri. 1886. On spect. 15 8 Zingerle had made the correction *praemia cum laudum ferret, adhuc poterat*, before he knew that Ellis had published the same conjecture in 1885. Martial has *praemia ferre*, e.g. i 25 6. 31 3. vi 58 10. With iii 63 6 Zingerle compares Tibull. i 7 38 *movit et ad certos nescia membra modos*. 5. Priscillian. *Ein neu aufgefundenener Schriftsteller des 4. Jahrhunderts*. Vortrag von Dr. Georg Schepss. 26 pp. Würzburg, 1886. Rev. by J. Huemer. The author, beheaded as a heretic in 385, will now be known to us by eleven treatises, more or less complete, which fill 145 leaves of a MS. assigned by the best judges to the 5th or 6th cent. The biblical citations are preheronymian and correspond closely to those in Aug. spec. Schepss has undertaken to edit the book for the Vienna library of Latin fathers. The divinity of the heretics, Leusibora, named by Jerome, has been discovered by Schepss in Job 38 39 *θηπελας δὲ λέουσι βοράν*, turned into *tu capies Leosiboram*. . . . Under 'Miscellen' J. M. Stowasser comments (1) *Platon's Protagoras*, v. Dr. J. Deuschle. 4 Aufl. bearb. v. Dr. Ch. W. J. Cron. pp. 140. Leipzig, Teubner, 1884; (2) *Taciti Germania*, Erl. v. Dr. H. Schweizer-Sidler. 4 Aufl. pp. xvi 95. Halle, Waisenhaus. 1884. (3) *Platon's ausgewählte Dialoge*. Erkl. v. C. Schmelzer. Berlin, Weidmann. 1883-4, vol vi pp. 111. (Meno, Euthyphro); vii pts. 1 and 2 pp. 203, 260 (republic).

Hermes, vol. xxii. part 1, contains: 1. *Die Obeliskeninschrift von Philae*, by U. Wilcken, in which Letronne's explanation (*Réc. des Inscr. Gr. and Lat. de l'Égypte*, i. p. 333, &c.) is corrected through the light afforded by the cursive Greek papyri. The answer to the priests' petition (A) is shown to be written by the king, not by his *ἐπιστολογράφος*, whose position therefore as a responsible minister is not proved, and Wilcken's conjecture that the priests of Isis were also priests of the Ptolemies here, as at Alexandria, Ptolemais and Thebes, is confirmed by the hieroglyphics on the obelisk. 2. *Der Capitolinische Jupitertempel und der Italische Fuss*, by O. Richter; already discussed in vol. xviii.

Richter gives up his theory that Dionys. (iv. 61) states the dimensions of the temple in the old 'Italian feet' of 278m, and not the Graeco-Roman feet of 296m, but cites various measurements from the walls of Italian towns as well as Rome to prove that the Italian foot was in use in them. 3. *Die Ueberlieferung über die Römischen Penaten*, by G. Wisowa, who correcting tradition by archaeology shows that the P. were old Italian deities, identified perhaps in the fifth century with the Dioscuri (see Dionys. i. 68, and the denarii of M. Fonteius and C. Sulpicius). Then Cassius Hemina confused them with the Samothracian Kabiri, while Varro gives them a Trojan origin, and looks for their proper representation in the 'sigilla lignea' of Lavinium, rather than in the Dioscuri figures in the temple of the P. at Rome. Kept then in the Vesta temple (*Tac. Ann.* xv. 41) they gave rise to all sorts of speculations as to their nature and number. 4. *Zur Kritik des Rottiers Lycurg*, by L. Cohn, deals with comparative value of two MSS., the Crippsianus (A) and the Oxoniensis (N). In opposition to Rehdantz and Thalheim, Cohn prefers the latter, as less vitiated by grammarians' corrections or interpolations. 5. A letter of W. Dörpfeld to Mommsen denying the identity of the Roman and Italian feet. 6. *Zu den Griechischen Sacralalterthümern*, by P. Stengel: a criticism on passages from Hipponax (cited in Tzetzes), Aristoph. (Eq. 1140) and Lysias And. vi. 53, and the Scholia on them, supposed to prove human sacrifices at the Thargelia. The sacrifices really took place, but only on occasions of pestilence, &c.; Harpokration, who alone mentions the Thargelia, confuses these occasions with the annual sacrifice to Demeter at that festival. 7. *Die Römischen Tribuseintheilung nach dem marssischen Krieg*, by Th. Mommsen, who proves, in opposition to Beloch, (1) that the faithful as well as the unfaithful Italian cities were confined to eight tribes by the law of 664, but (2) that this arrangement was temporary, and that both classes of cities were afterwards distributed among all the country tribes. The last point he proves by inscriptions. 8. *Demotika der Attischen Metochen* by U. von W. Mollendorff: inferences as to distribution of μέτοικοι among the demes from Attic inscriptions dating 430 to 330 B.C.; to be continued.

Among the *Miscellen* we can only mention C. Robert: eine Attische Künstlerinschrift, discovered last year on the abacus of a Doric capital near the Propylaea: Robert restores thus:

Νάρχος ἀνέθηκεν δ' κεραμε
us ἔργον ἀπαρχὴν τ(ῇ) Ἀθηναίᾳ
'Αντήνωρ ἐποίησεν
ὁ Εὐμαρο(ν)ς τὸ ἀγάλμα.

and U. Wilchen, 'Die memphitischen Papyri der Königl. Bibliothek zu Berlin, u. der Kais. Bibl. zu Petersburg.'

Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie u. Pädagogik. Fleckeisen u. Masius. 1887. Heft 1 contains (1) *Nautisches zu Homeros*, by A. Breusing, notes on the longer stretches of Odysseus' voyage. (2) Emend. to *Hymn. Herm.* 234, αἰὼν ἀπειλῶν for αὐτὸς Ἀπόλλων, by A. Ludwig. (3) *Zum Homerischen Margites*, by E. Hiller, showing that the lines ἡλθέ τις κ.τ.λ. quoted by Marius Victorinus II. c. 74, s. 79, and elsewhere, are probably the beginning of a spurious introduction to *Margites*: that the iambic trimeters of the poem were probably original, and that Pigree was not the author. (4) Emendations to Eur. *Medea*, by F. Giesing, v. 217 τοὺς δ' οὐ θυγατέρας οἱ γ' ἀφ' ἡσυχίου ποδός, v. 838 ἀμβροσίους τε πνοάς, v. 42 μὴ τὴν τύραννον, vv. 40 and 41 being omitted. (5) *Der Beschluss der Phratric Demotiwinda*, CIA. II.

2 n. 841^b, by G. Gilbert, a detailed explanation of the decree. (6) Emendations to Xen. *Hellenica* (19 passages) by A. Otto. (7) *Zur Chronologie u. Geschichte der Perserkriege*, by G. Busolt, a paper founded on the lately-discovered fact that there was a partial solar eclipse visible from the Isthmus on Oct. 2nd, 480 B.C. (cf. Herod. IX. 10). From this date the author reckons backwards and fixes other dates, e.g. battle of Salamis on Sept. 27th or 28th. (8) *Der Faden der Ariadne*, by O. Keller, suggesting that the Labyrinth was really a mine in which, as in a certain Egyptian emerald-mine, described by an Arabic writer Makrisi (†1442), a clue of rope was fastened for the guidance of the miners. (9) *Dionysios Periegetes*, by G. F. Unger, confirming the hypothesis that this writer lived about A.D. 90. (10) *Zu Aristoteles Poetik*, by F. Süsemihl, two conjectural additions, 18, 1455^b 32 ff. τὸ δὲ τέταρτον <ἢ ἀπλῆ, οὐκ> * παρέκβασις δ' ἡ τερατώδης, οὐκ αἱ τε Φορκίδες κ.τ.λ. and 24, 1459^b 8 ff. ἀναγνωρίσεων καὶ παθημάτων <καὶ ἡδῶν>. (11) Note by A. Ludwig that ἡμιμήης-μήητος is right (not -μήη, -μήητος) in the passages cited. (12) *Carmen*, by E. Baehrens, deriving this word from root car 'cut,' which appears in cārēre, carina, carmen, cardo ('scheidelinie'), so that carmen is speech 'rhythmically divided,' cf. Cic. de Or. III. 48, 186. (13) *Zu Caesars Bellum Civile*, three emendations to Book I., by H. Gilbert. (14) *Zu Ciceros Büchern de Oratore*, by W. Friedrich, a description of several MSS. lately collated and a list of new readings. (15) *Zu Arnobius*, by F. Polle, suggesting in *adv. Nat.* IV. 21 *supercillii nutu* and similarly *pollidia leto* in the fragment of Ennius quoted by Cic. *Tusc.* I. § 48. (16) A note by 'H. P.' showing that Robert Schumann, the musician, was employed as one of the revisers and correctors for the Schneeberg edition of Forcellini.

The paedagogic portion of the same *Jahrbuch* contains, among other things, the first part of the report of a meeting of schoolmasters (in Hanover, Oct. 5th and 6th, 1886) for the purpose of abolishing the distinction between Gymnasien and Realschulen and establishing, instead, 'Einheitsschulen,' in which modern subjects are to be taught at the expense of Latin, and Germany, now politically united, is to be mentally and spiritually 'unified' under the influence of Greek. About 100 schoolmasters attended the conference.

Leipziger Studien ix. 1 consists of a 'historia critica' in Latin of Greek and Roman 'consolations,' by Carolus Buresch, 1-172. The most ancient consolatio we possess, the Axiochus by the Socratic Aeschines, is defective in places (p. 13), and may enshrine some poetical fragments (p. 18 sq.). Crantor and Epicurus both used the Axiochus: Lucr. 3, 830-1094 comes from Epicurus (p. 60 sq.). The consolatio of Plutarch, borrowed like that of Cicero from Crantor, is genuine (p. 65). The ἀπαρτίσμα of Antiphon in Stobaeus are from the τέχνη ἀντίφρωνος of the sophist. The tetralogies also are probably not by the orator but by the sophist. Seneca's *consolatio ad Marcianum*: date discussed (p. 108): the ad Polybium is a forgery. There are several excursus, among which on p. 135 are emendations of Boethius' poems, p. 138 comparison of con and σύν in composition (the con in *condoleo, conqueror* = *penitus*) p. 140 on *apologus* = *fabula*. The number ends with an epimetrum on Philodemus περὶ θανάτου, promising in a short time an edition and commentary thereof: p. 162 a list of new words in Philodemus. Among passages discussed or emended are Statius' *epicedion in patrem*, 54 (p. 5) epitaph of Callimachus (p. 44), Axiochus 370a (p. 102), Stobaeus p. 47, 21 (p. 82). Notice also a note on optative with πῶς to express wish in late Greek (p. 128).

Leipziger Studien ix. 2 (pp. 173-262) *De fastis consularibus antiquissimis* (C. Cichorius). The history of the Fasti is here traced by means of the cognomina which they exhibit. 'Cognomina were absent from the oldest Fasti; at a later date they were added (conjecturally, as it would seem) by two writers in two different ways. Hence we have two "recensiones"; one, due to Licinius Macer, is preserved in Idatius, the Chronicon Paschale and certain parts of Livy and Dionysius; the other, connected with the name of Castor, reappears in Diodorus. These two recensiones were united together by a writer of the Ciceronian age, probably Atticus, and this third version, containing the cognomina of both the earlier ones, is the source of the Fasti Capitolini.' The paper is clever and acute; but there is a very weak attack (p. 175) on Jordan's view that 'Vetusius &c.' are due to Sullan grammarians. (pp. 263-336) *de rebus Tegeaticis* (G. Schwedler). An account of the history and constitution of the Arcadian Tegea in four chapters, the *pagi*, the tribes, the monarchy and the republic. (pp. 337-342) *Apinae tricaeque* (O. Ribbeck) '*Apinae* belongs to the Greek εἰς Ἀφάνας, *tricae* is plural from *trica*, accus. of ὀπίξ. "Afannae" (= *apinae*) should be read in Apul. Met. ix. 10 and x. 10 (cp. Wölfflin's Archiv 2, 341, 597). The whole expression comes probably from a Greek comedy.' Ribbeck does not notice Nettleship's conjecture *aginae* (*Journal of Phil.* xi. 100).

Bezenberger's *Beiträge zur Kunde der Indogermanischen Sprachen*. Vol. xii. part 3 (1887).

PROFESSOR BLASS collects the dialectic inscriptions of Corinth, Sicyon, Phlius, etc. Kaulin writes on a Lettish dialect of Livonia. Collitz, dating from Philadelphia, defends against Osthoff his claim to the discovery of the 'palatal-law': a polemic which we might have been spared. The editor supplies some interesting etymologies, e.g. Lat. *arbitrator* Umbr. *ad-pultrati*, Old Norse *at-kvaði* (Eng. *quoth*), κρόσσα Eng. *roof*, οἶνω Lith. *tvatnytis*, τὰγος Lith. *danginti* Sk. *dagh*. Bury well connects Lat. *ul-s* and Eng. *out*: less satisfactorily he makes *simul* = ἀμύδ-ις (what of ἀμύδ-ις?), and attempts to confine Lat. *l* for *t* to cases in which a *v*-sound precedes or follows.

Theologische Literaturzeitung, herausg. von AD. HARNACK und F. SCHÜRER. The following articles may be noticed. 29 Jan.—Holzmann, *Lehrbuch der Historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das N.T.* 2^{te} Aufl. (Schürer). The best book for information as to the present state of the various questions about N.T. Introduction. The improvements introduced in the second edition are that it gives (1) the *exegetic* literature for the several books; (2) a new section on the Apocrypha of the N.T.; (3) an index.—Vischer, *Die Offenbarung Johannis eine Jüdische Apokalypse in Christlicher Bearbeitung. Mit einem Nachwort von Ad. Harnack (Texte und Untersuchungen, Bd. II. Heft 3)*. Overbeck). Some thirty years ago Lücke said that the ground from which the Revelation of St. John sprang would be found in Jewish Apocalyptic literature. Vischer's book is an attempt to work out this conception critically, pointing out what portions must be referred to the original Jewish Apocalypse, and what are Christian additions. Overbeck thinks that Vischer's hypothesis may claim a high degree of probability, though he doubts whether his general result is so 'vollständig positiv' as the author supposes.—Weyland, *Compilatien en Omverkingshypothesen toegepast op de Apocalypse van Johannes* (Overbeck). Another work on the same hypothesis as Vischer's, and agreeing to a considerable extent in

results.—Zur '*Lehre der Zwölf Apostel*.' 3^{te} Artikel. A continuation of the series of articles in which Harnack is giving an account of the principal books relating to the 'Teaching of the Twelve Apostles.' In this number he directs attention to the services of the American scholars Harris, Orris, and Warfield in directing attention to the fact that Athanasius made use of the Didache in the *Σύνταγμα Διδασκαλίας*.—Krüger, *Lucifer von Calaris* (Möller). Important monograph for the history of Lucifer's time. In appendices, it discusses (among other things) the Canon of Scripture which Lucifer used, and controverts Caspari's hypothesis that Lucifer was the author of the baptismal exhortation in his *Quellen zur Gesch. des Taufsymbols*, II. 128-182. 12 Feb.—Thoma, *Ein Ritt ins Gelobte Land* (Socin). An attempt to describe the condition of Palestine in the time of Solomon. Archaeology good.—Weizsäcker, *Das Apostolische Zeitalter der Christlichen Kirche* (Looss). Important article. Looss compares throughout Weizsäcker's statements with those which he has made at various times on the same subject in the *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, and concludes that he has retrograded towards the old Tübingen school. In particular, he is much too sceptical as to the historical character of the Acts. Harnack, in his article on the 'Teaching' (col. 33) thinks that Weizsäcker's book can scarcely be surpassed. 26 Feb.—Finsler, *Wellhausen's Ansicht* (Baethgen). A small book, but hits some blots in Wellhausen's theory with great dexterity.—Abercius von Hieropolis, nicht Hierapolis (Krüger). A notice (taken, with acknowledgement from Lightfoot's *Ignatius* I. 467 ff.) of the interesting discoveries of Mr. W. M. Ramsay (see *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, July 1882, and *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1882, p. 339, and 1883, p. 424) which prove that Abercius belonged to Hieropolis, and have made it possible to restore his epitaph. 12 Mar.—Stanton, *The Jewish and Christian Messiah* (Schürer). The book is a very pleasant phenomenon, and the author's method, that of comparing Christian ideas with Jewish, unquestionably the right one. Moreover, he is well qualified for his work by his freedom from prejudice, and his knowledge of the subject; but Schürer thinks that he has not paid sufficient attention to the mediatorial aspect of the Messiah.—Bigg, *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria* (A. Harnack). A highly laudatory notice. The work is based on an admirable knowledge of the works of the Alexandrines, and shows both great insight and intellect, and excellent style. Clement's views have probably never before been so well and clearly stated. Bigg follows Harnack in taking Tertullian's 'Persona' juristically; Harnack thinks he ought to have so taken 'substantia' also. Harnack objects to Bigg's statement that, the interest, the meaning, of Gnosticism rest entirely upon its ethical motive.

Revue numismatique. Paris. 1887. Part I.

'Lycian Coins,' by J. P. Six. The concluding part of Mr. Six's elaborate study of Lycian numismatics begun in the *Revue* for 1886. An Index of Types, Symbols and Proper Names is appended.—'The date of the accession of Constantine the Great according to Eusebius and the coins,' by the Comte de Westphalen. The writer endeavours, from numismatic evidence, to explain the origin of two apparently contradictory statements in Eusebius (*Vita Const.* I. 5; iv. 53) as to the duration of Constantine's reign.—Reviews: Wroth's 'Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Crete and the Aegean Islands,' by E. Babelon.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS PUBLISHED FROM FEBRUARY 15 TO MARCH 15, 1887.

BOOKS PUBLISHED IN ENGLAND.

- Caesar.* Gaii Julii Caesaris de bello Gallico Commentariorum V. Edited with Notes and Vocabulary for use of schools by C. Colbeck, M.A. 16mo. vi. 128 pp. Map. London, Macmillan. 1s. 6d.
- Livy.* Books V., VI. and VII. With Introduction and Notes by A. R. Cluer, B.A., Balliol College. Second edition revised by P. E. Matheson, M.A., New College. 12mo. 228, 147 pp. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 5s.
- Mahaffy* (J. P.) Rambles and Studies in Greece. Third edition, revised and enlarged. Crown 8vo. xviii. 465 pp. Map and Illustrations. London. Macmillan. 10s. 6d.
- Ovid.* P. Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoseon XIII., XIV. Edited with Introduction, Analysis and Notes by Charles Simmons, M.A. 12mo. viii. 256 pp. London. Macmillan. 4s. 6d.
- Plato.* Talks with Socrates about Life. Translations from the Gorgias and the Republic. 12mo. xxii. 176 pp. London. Fisher Unwin. 3s. 6d.
- Reed* (S. Percy). The Candidates' Latin Grammar. Cr. 8vo. iv. 159 pp. London. Ward & Downey. 3s. 6d.
- Tacitus.* The Histories of Tacitus. Books I. and II. With Introduction and Notes by A. D. Godley, M.A. 12mo. xiv. 262 pp. London. Macmillan. 5s.
- Xenophon.* The Cyropaedia. Books I. and II. With Introduction and Notes by the Rev. H. Holden. Edited for the Syndics of the University Press. 2 vols. 12mo. lxviii. 355 pp. 1 map. 6s.

BOOKS PUBLISHED ON THE CONTINENT.

- Aristoteles.* Traité de la génération des animaux d'Aristote traduit en Français pour la première fois et accompagné de notes perpétuelles par J. Barthélemy-Saint-Hilaire. 2 vols. 8vo. cclxxiv. 124, 551 pp. Paris. Hachette. 20 fr.
- Bauer* (A.) Thukydidēs und H. Müller-Strübing. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der philologischen Methode. 8vo. 31 pp. Nördlingen. Beck. 70 pf.
- Bojnčić* (Jr. von). Denkmäler des Mithras Kultus in Kroatien. 8vo. 16 pp. 2 pl. Agram. Hartmann. 60 pf.
- Briel* (A.) De Callistrato et Philonide sive de actionibus Aristophaneis. 8vo. 68 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 1 Mk. 60.
- Carmina figurata graeca.* Ad fidem potissimum codicis Palatini edidit, prolegomenis instruxit, app. crit., scholia adj. C. Haebler. Ed. II. correctior. 8vo. Hannover. Hahn. 3 Mk.
- Casati* (C. C.) La gens; origine étrusque de la gens romaine (extr. Mémoires de l'Académie étrusque). 8vo. 18 pp. Paris. Didot.
- Cauwercet* (Chr.) Étude sur la langue de la rhétorique et de la critique littéraire dans Cicéron. 8vo. 247 pp. Paris. Hachette. 4 fr.
- Cicero.* Orationes pro A. Licinio Archia poeta, pro Q. Ligario, pro M. Marcello, scholarum in usum ad opt. ed. fidem rec. C. Fumagalli. 16mo. 36 pp. Verona. Drucker et Tedeschi. 30c.
- Pro Q. Ligario oratio, con note italiane di C. Fumagalli. 16mo. 26 pp. Verona. Drucker et Tedeschi. 50c.
- Cons* (L.) Notions sommaires d'histoire de l'antiquité, avec portraits historiques, gravures et cartes. 12mo. 358 pp. Paris. Delagrave. 50c.
- Crozals* (J. de) Histoire de la civilisation. Tome 1^{er}. Depuis les temps antiques jusqu'à Charlemagne. 12mo. 691 pp. Paris. Delagrave. 4 fr. 50c.
- Darmesteter* (A.) La vie des mots étudiée dans leurs significations. 12mo. xii. 212 pp. Paris. Delagrave. 2 fr.
- Engel* (E.) Die Aussprache des Griechischen. Ein Schnitt in einen Schulzopf. 8vo. VII. 168 pp. Jena. Costenoble. 2 Mk. 50.
- echt* (K.) Griechisches Übungsbuch für Untertertia. 2. gänzlich umgearbeitete Aufl. 8vo. iv. 165 pp. Freiburg. Herder. 1 Mk. 25.
- Fügner* (F.) Cäsarsätze zur Einübung der latein. Syntax. 2 verm. Aufl. 8vo. III. 58 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 1 Mk.
- Gebhard* (F.) Übungsbuch zum Übersetzen aus dem Deutschen ins Lateinische. 2. verbesserte und verm. Auflage. 8vo. viii. 162 pp. Amberg. Pohl. 1 Mk. 60.
- Girard* (J.) Le sentiment religieux en Grèce d'Homère à Eschyle, étudié dans son développement moral et dans son caractère dramatique. Troisième édition. 12mo. 452 pp. Paris. Hachette. 3 fr. 50.
- Goetz* (G.) Nova meletmata Festina. 4to. 8 pp. Jena. 50 pf.
- Hartel* (W. von) Bibliotheca patrum latinorum hispanensium. Band I. Nach den Aufzeichnungen G. Loewe's bearbeitet. (extr. Sitzungsberichte d. Wiener Akad.) 8vo. iii. 542 pp. Vienna. Gerold. 8 Mk.
- Jordan* (H.) Comm. fragm. de Sallustii hist. libri II. reliquiis quae ad bellum paticum Servilianum pertinent. 4to. 8 pp. Königsberg. 20 pf.
- Jousse andot* (L.) Des assesseurs près des tribunaux romains (extr. Compte rendu de l'Académie des sciences morales et politiques). 8vo. 21 pp. Paris. Larose et Forel.
- Kirchhoff* (A.) Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Alphabets. 4. umgearb. Aufl. VI. 180 pp. 1 map, 2 plates. Gütersloh. Bertelsmann. 6 Mk.
- Kramer* (O.) De Pelopis fabula. Pars I. 8vo. 42 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk.
- Lucrèce.* De la nature des choses. Livre cinquième. Avec traduction française en regard, introduction, analyse et notes par E. Talbot. 12mo. lxxii. 116 pp. Paris. Delalain. 1 fr. 80c.
- Meyer* (E. H.) Homer und die Ilias. 8vo. VII. 258 pp. Berlin. Oppenheim. 4 Mk. 50.
- Richardson* (G. M.) De 'dum' particula apud priscos scriptores latinos usu. 8vo. 95 pp. Leipzig. 2 Mk.
- Simon* (J.) Zur zweiten Hälfte der Inschrift von Gortyn. (extr. Wiener Studien). 8vo. 24 pp. Vienna. Gerold. 80 pf.
- Sophokles* erklärt von J. Holub. I. Oidipus Tyrannos. 8vo. xii. 92 pp. 1 plate. Paderborn. F. Schöningh. 1 Mk. 50.
- Spangenbergii* (Joh.) bellum grammaticale, iterum edidit R. Schneider. 8vo. x. 41 pp. Göttingen. Vandenhoeck. 1 Mk.
- Testamentum Vetus, Graece, juxta LXX interpretes.* Ed. C. de Tischendorf. Ed. VII. rec. supplementum auxit E. Nestle. 2 vols. 8vo. 81, 684, 616, 10, 203 pp. Leipzig. Brockhaus. 15 Mk.
- Nestle's Supplement, separately, 5 Mk.
- Valentin.* Horatii carmen II. 7 neu erklärt. 8vo. 16 pp. Frankfurt. Rütten und Loening. 50 pf.
- Vergil.* L'Enéide, testo, costruzione, versione letterale, versione libera, sommari e note. Libro I. 16mo. 107 pp. Verona. Drucker et Tedeschi. 1 f. 50c.
- Willems* (P.) Les élections municipales à Pompéi. 8vo. 143 pp. Paris. Thorin. 2 fr. 50.
- Windisch* (E.) Georg Curtius. Eine Charakteristik. 8vo. 56 pp. Berlin. Calvary. 2 Mk. 40.
- Xenophon.* Extraits des Mémoires expliqués et traduits par M. Sommer. 12mo. 231 pp. Paris. Hachette. 2 fr. 50.

UNIVERSITY INTELLIGENCE.

(Continued from page 77.)

OXFORD.

EXAMINATIONS.

FORTHCOMING SCHOLARSHIP EXAMINATIONS.

(In all the following Examinations, unless otherwise stated, Candidates must be under 19 years of age).

New College: Examination begins Tuesday, May 3, Exhibition for Chemistry or Biology (with elementary Mechanics, Physics and Classics), value £50. No limit of age. Candidates to call at New College day before with testimonials.

(*Abbott Scholarship*: Tuesday, May 3, for Classics, value about £60 for three years. Candidates must be sons of clergymen and need assistance. It is not tenable with another Scholarship or Exhibition above £50 in value. For further particulars apply to Principal of St. Mary Hall.)

Merton College: Wednesday, June 8, Exhibition in Modern History, value £60. No limit of age. For details see *University Gazette*, February 1.—June 28, Postmastership for Chemistry and Physics (with optional Biology), value £80. Candidates to call on the Warden on the day before the Examination in either case.

Corpus: Wednesday, June 28, along with Merton, one Natural Science Scholarship, value £80. Same conditions as Merton; candidates to call on the Warden of Merton.

University, Exeter, Oriel, Brasenose, Christ Church Combined Examination: Tuesday, June 28, at Christ Church. Names and papers to be sent to Provost of Oriel, on or before June 20, stating if the candidates wish to board in one of the colleges, and candidates have also to call at Exeter College on June 27 between 8–10 P.M. The Scholarships and Exhibitions to be awarded are as follows:—*Brasenose*: Three Classical Scholarships, value £80, and three Hulme Exhibitions, two for Classics and one for Modern History, value £80. Candidates for the Hulmes must be under 20 years of age on July 7, 1887, and must need assistance, and should call on the Principal before June 1. For details of Modern History Exhibitions see *University Gazette*, February 1. Also four classical Somerset Scholarships, limited in the first instance to Manchester, Marlborough, and Hereford Schools, but may be thrown open in default of properly qualified candidates. *Christ Church*: Two Classical Scholarships, value £80. Two Exhibitions, value about £85. *Exeter*: Two Classical Scholarships, value £80. One Carter Scholarship for Classics, value £80, no limit of age, *ceteris paribus* preference given to candidates

born in Kent. One Hasker Scholarship, value £80, mainly Divinity, partly Classical, no limit of age. One Classical Exhibition, value £80. For Stapledon How, and other Scholarships or Exhibitions, see *University Gazette*, February 1. *Oriel*: Three Classical Scholarships, value £80. One Bible-Clerkship, candidates for which must show that they need assistance, value about £110. *University*: Four Classical Scholarships, value £80.

New College: Wednesday, October 12, History Exhibition, value £50. No limit of age.

RESULTS OF EXAMINATIONS: University Prizes—*Arnold Essay*, H. W. Blunt, Oriel (King's College School). *Boden Sanskrit Scholar*, N. S. Brodie, Christ Church (University College School). *Vinerian Law Scholar*, R. A. Shephard, Trinity (Sedbergh): Accessit, J. C. Ledlie, Lincoln (Belfast). Denyer and Johnson Theological Scholars—1. L. J. M. Bebb, Brasenose (Winchester); 2. E. T. Green, St. John's (Westminster).

COLLEGE SCHOLARSHIPS: *University*, Mth. Sch. J. M. Chambers (Wolverhampton), E. Smith (Clifton). *Balliol*, Mth. Exh. H. J. R. Murray (Mill Hill); Sc. Sch. W. Pullinger (Manchester); Hist. Sch. C. J. S. Howard (Rugby), G. A. Wood (Owens); Hist. Exh. A. Hepburn (Leamington). *Merton*, Mth. Postm. J. H. Marston (Wolverhampton). *Exeter*, Mth. Sch. J. Forbes (Carlisle). *Queens*, Cl. Sch. C. E. M. Hawkesworth (Clifton), C. J. N. Fleming (Fettes), W. A. Appleyard (Birmingham), V. G. Crawley (St. Paul's), E. A. C. Stowell (Sedbergh), J. B. Firth (Bradford), F. E. Webb (Oxford High School), W. P. Bond (Merchant Taylors); Sc. Sch. W. B. Crump (Bradford); Mth. and Sc. Exh. W. C. Dobie (Bradford); Cl. Exh. J. H. G. Wilson (York); Mth. Exh. W. E. K. Hare (Heversham), S. Baker (Manchester), A. E. Dyer (Southwark), J. Finniswood (St. Bees), W. H. Finney (Owens), G. Smallpiece (St. Bees); Bible Clerk, A. D. Miller (Glasgow College). *New College*, Mth. Sch. E. W. Lovegrove (Crosby). *Magdalen*, Mth. Demy, W. J. Wood (Portsmouth), Mth. Exh. A. J. Chambers (Manchester); Sc. Dem. J. F. Childs (Portsmouth), J. S. Fairbairn (Bradford). *Brasenose*, Mth. Sch. J. H. Denbigh (Bath College). *Christ Church*, Mth. Exh. T. P. Kent (Kingswood); Sc. Exh. J. W. Macpherson (Dublin School of Science); Hist. Sch. E. Owen (Lampeter). *Trinity*, Sc. Exh. H. C. Dowdall (Rugby). *St. John's*, Cuthbert Sch. A. S. Peake (Coventry). *Wadham*, Mth. Sch. S. A. F. White (Portsmouth). *Hertford*, Mth. Exh. H. Y. Plum (Worcester Free School).

CAMBRIDGE.

1. FORTHCOMING SCHOLARSHIP EXAMINATIONS.

(Candidates for the following must be under 19 years of age).

Downing: Exam. begins June 1. Two Minor Scholarships, value £50. Subjects: Law and Natural Science.

Selwyn: June 15. One Classical and one Mathematical Scholarship, value £30.

Caius: October 1. One Scholarship in Oriental languages, one in Mediaeval and Modern languages, value £50.

2. RESULTS OF EXAMINATIONS.

Poets Medal: N. K. Stephen, Trinity (Fettes). *Porson Prize*: W. G. Headlam, King's (Harrow); honourably mentioned N. K. Stephen, and J. J. Withers, King's (Eton). *Browne Medals*: for Greek Hexameters, Latin Ode, and Latin Epigram, W. G. Headlam; for Greek Epigram, F. W. Thomas, Trinity (Birmingham). *Burney Prize*: W. G. Manley, Pembroke (Rugby). *Fellowships*: A. Nairne has been elected to a fellowship at *Jesus*: M. R. James (Eton) and G. L. Dickinson (Charterhouse) at *King's*: A. E. Shipley (private tuition) at *Christ's*: and S. J. Hickson at *Downing*.

COLLEGE SCHOLARSHIPS: *Trinity*: THIRD YEAR—*Sc. R. H. Adie* (Intern. Coll. London), *Cl. J. H. Badley* (Rugby), *Cl. W. C. Bridgeman* (Eton), *Mth. W. Dunn* (Blackheath), *Mth. W. D. Eggar* (Brighton), *Cl. S. W. Meek* (Harrow). SECOND YEAR—*Mth. J. J. Guest* (Marlborough), *Mth. V. T. Kirby* (Heversham), *Cl. F. J. L. Ogilvy* (Fettes), *Cl. B. Pares* (Harrow), *Mth. H. Savery* (Chr. Hosp.). FIRST YEAR—*Mth. F. W. Dyson* (Bradford), *Mth. G. F. Emery* (Ely), *Mth. P. C. Gaul* (Birmingham), *Cl. J. P. Gilson* (Haileybury), *Mth. and Sc. J. S. Mackenzie* (Glasgow), *Cl. O. Thompson* (Univ. Coll. Sch.), *Cl. G. A. Turner* (Oakham), *Mth. G. T. Walker* (St. Paul's). OPEN—*Cl. A. B. Cook* (St. Paul's), *G. A. Davies* (Owens), *Mth. T. A. E. Sanderson* (City of London). MINOR SCHOLARS—*Cl. W. J. Boycott* (Hereford), *C. Ll. Davies* (Marlborough), *Mth. A. Vaughan* (Univ. Coll. Sch.), *H. Cayley* (Sherborne), *Cl. A. E. Chilver* (Haileybury), *Mth. H. N. Sheppard* (Charterhouse), *A. E. Stamp* (St. Paul's). EXHIBITIONERS—*Mth. A. E. Broomfield* (St. Paul's), *J. F. Iselin* (Charterhouse), *A. P. Marwood* (Clifton), *Cl. R. A. Nicholson* (Aberdeen), *A. E. Pope* (St. Paul's).

St. John's: SCHOLARS—*Mth. J. H. Reeves* (Surrey County Sch.), *Cl. T. Hicklin* (Shrewsbury), *Sc. J. T. Hewitt* (S. Kensington Coll. of Science), *Mth. O. W.*

Owen (Liverpool Institute). MINOR SCHOLARS—*Mth. G. T. Bennett* (Univ. Coll. Sch.), *Cl. L. B. Radford* (Mansfield), *R. A. Leheldt* (priv. tuition). EXHIBITIONERS—*Mth. J. J. Alexander* (Belfast), *Sc. F. F. Blackman* (St. Barth. Hospital), *Cl. B. Constantine* (Bradford), *Hebrew, T. Heal* (priv. tuition), *Sc. H. E. Schmitz* (Owens), *Cl. St. J. B. Wynne-Willson* (Cheltenham). *King's*: *Cl. Scholars*—*T. B. Lewis* (Eton), *H. St. J. Thackeray* (Eton), *H. M. Beck* (Eton), *J. A. C. Tilley* (Eton), *A. G. Bather* (Rossall), *E. H. Miles* (Marlborough). Exhibitioners—*Mth. A. J. Mayne* (priv. tuition), *H. Aris* (Rossall), *Sc. E. R. Delbruck* (Clifton). *Peterhouse*: *Mth. L. T. Giles* (Chr. Hosp.), *Sc. A. G. Penny* (Clifton), *Cl. G. E. R. Brown* (St. Paul's). *Pembroke*: *Cl. Scholars*, *W. C. Geldart* (Tonbridge), *A. Jagger* (Shrewsbury), *W. K. Robertson* (Oundle), *B. Thompson* (Rossall), *Mth. Schol. P. W. Everett* (Ipswich), *H. A. Thomson* (Aldenhurst), *F. M. Marzials* (St. Paul's). *Caius*: *Mth. Sch. G. D. Tripp* (St. Paul's), *C. E. Cullis* (Birmingham), *Cl. Sch. T. A. Bertram* (City of London), *A. O. W. Staats* (Dulwich), *O. W. Whaley* (York), *Cl. Exh. J. Y. Lyle* (St. Paul's), *C. B. Wedd* (Boston), *Sc. Sch. J. B. Wood* (Newcastle, Staff.), *Mth. Exh. E. A. Peters* (Charterhouse), *F. C. Bothamley* (Giggleswick). *Corpus*: *Mth. Sch. T. W. Edmondson* (Skipton), *H. C. Roe* (Chr. Hosp.), *W. R. Hitchens* (Macclesfield), *Cl. Sch. W. F. Baldock* (Ipswich), *A. S. Lauprey* (Southwark). *Queens*: *Mth. Sch. P. Harrison* (St. Paul's), *R. N. Haygarth* (Isle of Man), *Lewis* (Lampeter), *S. A. Bennett* (Newcastle, Staff.), *White* (Bristol), *Cl. Sch. L. M. Dinwoody* (Isle of Man). *Jesus*: *Cl. Sch. H. O. B. Nicholson* (Leamington), *G. F. Clark* (St. Paul's), *W. R. Rendall* (Newton Abbot), *B. A. Snell* (Haileybury), *A. P. Annand* (Shrewsbury), *G. M. Gwyther* (Bradford), *Mth. Sch. O. Y. Maller* (Newton Abbot), *S. W. Burgess* (Rossall), *J. P. H. Soper* (Chigwell). *Christ's*: *Cl. A. T. Rackham* (City of London), *Mth. A. C. Dutt* (Wren and Gurney), *G. Middlemass* (Durham), *Cl. W. R. Elliston* (Ipswich), *Cl. and Mth. A. T. Pitt* (Derby); *Sc. H. L. C. de Candole* (St. Paul's), *Mth. R. N. Haygarth* (Isle of Man), *Cl. F. B. Baker* (Cheltenham). *Emmanuel*: *Mth. Sch. A. W. H. Compton* (Monkton Combe), *T. Hyett* (Cheltenham Gr. Sch.), *Mth. Exh. A. E. Daniels* (Leicester), *J. C. Denmead* (Exeter), *Cl. Exh. E. C. Arnold* (Merchant Taylors'), *Y. C. Davis* (Dulwich); *Sc. Sch. F. H. Windsor* (Owens). *Sidney*: *Mth. Sc. T. C. Hudson* (City of London), *W. H. Mitchell* (Bristol), *H. M. R. Dennis* (Chr. Hosp.), *Cl. Sch. J. Masham* (City of London), *C. E. Curtis* (Ipswich), *B. W. Wood* (Boston), *Cl. Exh. F. de W. Lushington* (Sutton Valence), *C. M. Thornton* (Tavistock), *Sc. Sch. H. Slade* (St. Paul's), *J. E. Beggs* (Manchester), *Sc. Exh. E. Whichello* (Newport).

MACMILLAN AND CO.'S LIST.

RECENT CLASSICAL WORKS.

HOMER.—The Iliad. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by WALTER LEAF, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. 8vo. Vol. I. Books I.—XII. 14s. [Vol. II. in preparation.]

ÆSCHYLUS.—The Seven against Thebes. Edited, with Introduction, Commentary, and Translation, by A. W. VERRALL, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

JUVENAL.—Thirteen Satires of Juvenal. With a Commentary. By J. E. B. MAYOR, M.A., Professor of Latin in the University of Cambridge. Crown 8vo. Vol. I. * Fourth Edition, revised and enlarged. 10s. 6d. Vol. II. Second Edition. 10s. 6d.

The new matter in this edition consists of an Introduction (pp. 1—53), Additional Notes (pp. 333—466), and Index (pp. 467—526). It is also issued separately, as a Supplement to the previous edition, at 5s.

PLATO.—Timæus. Edited, with Introduction and Notes by R. D. ARCHER-HIND, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. 8vo. [In the press.]

CAESAR.—The Gallic War. Edited, after Kraner, by A. S. WALPOLE, M.A., and Rev. JOHN BOND, M.A. Fcap. 8vo, 6s. [Classical Series.]

OVID.—Metamorphoses. Books XIII. and XIV. Edited, with Introduction, Analysis, and Notes, by C. SIMMONS, M.A., formerly of Balliol College, Classical Master in University College School, London. Fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d. [Classical Series.]

TACITUS.—The Histories. Books I. and II. Edited, with Introductions and Notes, by A. D. GODLEY, M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford. Fcap. 8vo, 5s. [Classical Series.]

ARISTOTLE.—The Rhetoric. Translated with an Analysis and Critical Notes, by the Rev. J. E. C. WELLDON, M.A., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, Head Master of Harrow. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THIRD EDITION, REVISED AND ENLARGED.

RAMBLES AND STUDIES IN GREECE. By J. P. MAHAFFY, Author of "Social Life in Greece" &c. With Illustrations. Third Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

AN EASTER VACATION IN GREECE. With Lists of books on Greek Travel and Topography, and Time-tables of Greek Railways and Steamers. By JOHN EDWIN SANDYS, Litt. D., Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, and Public Orator in the University of Cambridge. With a Map of Greece, and a Plan of Olympia. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Macmillan & Co.'s Descriptive Catalogue of New Educational Books is Now Ready, Post Free on Application.

MACMILLAN & CO. Bedford Street, London, W.C.

Verlag von CARL KONEGEN IN WIEN.

Bühler, Prof. Dr. G.—Leitfaden für den Elementar-
kurs des Sanskrit. Mit Uebungsstücken und zwei
Glossaren. Preis M. 5.

Hoffmann, Em.—Studien auf dem Gebiete der
lateinischen Syntax. Preis M. 3 Pf. 60.

Krichenbauer, A.—Theogonie und Astronomie.
Ihr Zusammenhang nachgewiesen an den Göttern der
Griechen, Aegyptier, Babylonier und Arier. Preis M. 12.

Müller-Strübing, H.—Thukydideische Forsch-
ungen. Preis M. 7.

P. OVIDI NASONIS HEROIDES.—Apparatu
critico instruit et editit Heuricus Stephanus Sedlmayer.
Preis M. 5.

Zu beziehen durch alle Buchhandlungen.

Verlag von Wilhelm Engelmann in Leipzig

BIBLIOTHECA SCRIPTORUM CLASSICORUM

herausgegeben
von

WILHELM ENGELMANN.

Achte Auflage, umfassend die Literatur von
1700 bis 1878.

neu bearbeitet von

DR. E. PREUSS.

1. Abtheilung: **Scriptores Graeci**. gr. 8. 1880. geh. M. 20.
geb. M. 21. 50.

2. Abtheilung: **Scriptores Latini**. gr. 8. 1882. geh. M. 16.
geb. M. 17. 50.

Ausgabe auf Schreibpapier: I. Abth. M. 26; II. Abth. M. 20.

Zu beziehen durch alle Buchhandlungen des In- und Auslandes.

Verlag von FERDINAND SCHÖNINGH, Paderborn.

Seben erschienen und durch alle Buchhandlungen zu beziehen.

Sophocles, I. Oidipus tyrannos. Erklärt von J. HOLUB. Mit einer Abbildung. 105 S. 8°. M. 1.50.

Holub geht bei der Feststellung des Textes von der Behauptung aus, der **Cod. LA** sei auf die Art entstanden, dass der Text aus einem fast fehlerfreien Archetypus von einem Griechen dictirt wurde.

A Rough List of Editions of Greek and Latin Authors, Profane and Ecclesiastical, and of Works on the Language, Literature, Art, History, and Religion of Greece and Rome (many scarce and valuable), chiefly from the libraries of the late RECTOR OF LINCOLN, the DEAN OF LINCOLN, and the REV. W. G. COOKESLEY, on sale at the affixed net prices by D. NUTT, 270, Strand, London.

ABHANDLUNGEN (Sprachwissenschaftliche), hervor-
gegangen aus G. Curtius' Grammatischer Gesellschaft. 8vo. Leipzig, 1874. 2s.

AESCHINIS in Ctesiphontem et **DEMOSTHENIS** de corona
orationes, commentario instr. J. H. Bremi. 8vo. London,
1837. Calif. 2s. 6d.

AESCHYLI tragoediae, comment. illustr. Ch. G.
Schütz. 2 vols., 8vo. Oxonii, 1810. Sewed. 3s.

— **Agamemnon**, emend., notas et glossarium
adjecit C. J. Blomfield. Ed. V. 8vo. London, 1839.
Half-bound, interleaved, and with numerous manuscript
notes. 3s. 6d.

— **Agamemnon**. With notes by Th. W. Peile.
8vo. London, 1839. Calif. 2s. 6d.

— **Eumenides**. Recens. et illustr. Jac. Scholefield.
8vo. Cantabr. 1843.—**Eumenides** rec. et notis instr. Guil.
Linwood. Oxonii, 1844. In one volume. 8vo. Half-
bound. 1s. 6d.

AESOPUS. *Fabulae Aesopicae*, quales ante Planudem
ferebantur, gr. et lat. ed. ill. F. de Furia. Ed. major.
8vo. Lips. 1810. Calif. gilt. 5s. 6d.

AKEN (A. F.), Die Grundzüge der Lehre vom
Tempus und Modus im Griechischen, historisch und ver-
gleichend ausgestellt. 8vo. Rostock, 1861. 1s. 6d.

ALCUINI, Abbatis Caroli Magni, Opera post D.
Andream Quercetanum editit et illustravit Frobenius.
2 vols. in 3. folio. Ratisbon, 1777. Best edition, clean
and sound copy, in full calf, gilt back, red edges. 2s. 2s.

ALEXANDRI APHRODISIENSIS Quaestiones naturales,
de anima, morales, graece. Ed. V. Trincavelli. Folio.
Venetiis, 1536. Bourds. 12s. 6d.

ALLIATI (L.). In antiquitatum Etruscarum fragmenta
ab Inghiramo edita a. inadversiones, add. ejusd. animad-
versio in libros Alph. Ciccarelli et auctores ab eo confictos.
16mo. Romae, 1642. Vellum. 1s. 6d.

ANACREONTIS carmina, graece, cum notis Guil.
Baxteri suisque ed. J. F. Fischer. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1793.
Half-bound. 3s. 6d.

ANTHOLOGIA graeca, ex rec. Brunckii, indices et
comment. adjecit F. Jacobs. 13 vols. 8vo. Lipsiae,
1791—1814. Half-bound. 2s. 12s. 6d.

APOLLONIUS Dyscolus de pronomine. Ed. I. Bekker.
8vo. Berol. 1813. Cloth. 2s.

APOLLONIUS von Perga, Sieben Bücher über Kegel-
schnitte nebst dem durch Halley wiederhergestellten
8. Buch. Deutsch bearbeitet von H. Balsam. Mit Anhang.
8vo. Berlin, 1861. 31 plates. Sewed. 5s. 6d.

ARISTOPHANIS Nubes cum scholiis, rec. I. Bekker. Cum
notis variorum. 8vo. Londoni, 1826. Half-bound.
2s. 6d.

— *The Clouds*, with notes, by T. Mitchell. 8vo.
London, 1838. Calif. 2s.

— *The Wasps*, with notes, by T. Mitchell. 8vo.
London, 1835. Half-bound. 2s.

— *Scholia Graeca in Aristophanis comedias* ed.
Guil. Dindorf. 3 vols in 2. 8vo. Lips. 1822. Half calf.
10s. 6d.

ARISTOTELES, Metaphysik. Grundtext, Übersetzung
und Commentar nebst erläuternden Abhandlungen von
A. Schwegger. 4 vols. in 2. 8vo. Tübingen, 1847-48.
Calif. extra. 2l 16s.

— *Rhetorica ad fidem manuscriptorum*. 8vo.
Oxoniae, 1826. Half calf, interleaved. 1s.

— *Excerpta ex Organo*, de simplicibus terminis,
de propositione et de syllogismo. Acc. Paelli de quinque
vocius liber. Gr. et Lat. 8vo. Oxonii, 1802. Half-bound.
1s.

— *Physique*, traduite en français, avec des notes
perpetuelles par J. Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire. 2 vols.
8vo. Paris, 1802. Half-calf. Out of print and rare.
2l 1s.

[—] **ACCIAJOLI (Donatus)** Expositio super libros
Ethicorum Aristotelis in novam traductionem Jo. Argy-
ropoli Bituntini. Fol. Florentiae (Jacobus de Ripoli) 1478.
Half-bound. 2s. 10s.

*. A beautiful and rare edition, printed in long lines (39 to
the page), in bold Roman characters. This copy has a few
marginal notes in an old hand.

- [ARISTOTELES] AFZELIUS (F. G.) Aristotelis de imputatione actionum doctrina. Upsalæ 1841. —Stahr (Ad) Aristoteles bei den Römern. Leipzig, 1881. 8vo. Half-calf. **3s. 6d.**
- [—] ALEXANDRI Aphrodis. Commentarius in libros Metaphysicos Aristotelis. Rec. H. Bonitz. svo. Berolini, 1847. Half-calf. **5s.**
- [—] BALDUS (Camillus) In physiognomia Aristotelis comment. fol. Bononiæ 1621. Engraved title. With Episcopal arms on the sides. Calf. Fine copy. **8s. 6d.**
- [—] BUCCAFERREAE (LUD.) Praelectiones in I. librum Physices Aristotelis. Folio. In Academia Veneta, 1558. Fine tall copy in green morocco, gilt edges, and richly gilt sides, the last leaves very slightly mended. **£1 1s.**
- [—] CABEI (Nic.) in Meteorologica commentaria. 4 vols. in 2. fol. Romæ 1646. Calf. From Dr. Parr's library. **15s.**
- [—] CLICHOTVEUS (J.) Introductio in X libros Ethicorum Aristotelis, adiectis commentariis. Editio II. Paribius, Henr. Stephanus, 1512.—ARISTOTELIS opus de Moribus, triplici conversione latina: Aristopoli Byzant., Leon Aretini, et antiqua, adjecto familiari Jac. Stapulensis commentario. Folio. Ibid. 1510. Black letter. Curious woodcut on the title. Calf. **10s. 6d.**
- [—] DUNS SCOTI (Jo.) Commentaria in XII libros Metaphysicæ et conclusiones 378 ex eadem. fol. Venetiis, Sim. de Luere, 1503.—ANT. THROMBETÆ opus in Metaphysicam. fol. Venetiis, B. de Locatellis, 1502.—EJUSDEM in tractatum formalitatum Scoti sententia.—ANT. SVRETI formalitates de mente Scoti, necnon Steph. Burlefer cum novis additionibus Magistri Maur. Hiberni. fol. Ibid., 1502.—GAJETANI in libros de coelo et mundo. fol. Venetiis, 1498. In one vol. Boards. **£1 1s.**
- [—] VATER (J. S.) Animadversiones et lectiones ad Aristotelis Rhetoricam, cum auctario J. A. Wolf. svo. Lipsiæ, 1794. Boards. **1s.**
- ARRIANI expeditio Alexandri et historia Indica. Græce et latine cum annotationibus et indice G. Raynelli. svo. Amsterdam, 1757. Morocco. **4s. 6d.**
- ARTEMIDORI Oneirocritica, rec. emend. notis Rigaltii et J. J. Reiskii auctore ill. J. G. Reiff. 2 vols. svo. Lipsiæ, 1805. Calf. **6s. 6d.**
- Ἀθηναίων Σύγγραμμα περιόδου. 10 vols. svo. Athens 1873—82. Plates. Complete set of this important periodical, full of archeological, topographical and philological papers. **£5.**
- ATHENÆUS, ex recensione Guil. Dindorfii. 3 vols. svo. Lipsiæ 1827. Half calf gilt, uncut. **£1 1s.**
- AUSONI Opera. rec. J. Tollius, cum notis variorum. svo. Amstelodami, 1671. Vellum. **2s. 6d.**
- BECKMANN (J.), de historia naturali veterum libellus. 12mo. Petropoli, 1766. **1s.**
- BEHR (Baron). Recherches sur l'histoire des temps héroïques de la Grèce. svo. Paris, 1856. 5 Maps. **3s. 6d.**
- BEKKER (L.), Homerische Blätter. svo. Bonn, 1863. cloth, uncut. **3s.**
- BEMMELEN (J. F. van), de M. Livii Drusis patre et filio tribunis plebis. svo. Lugduni Bat., 1826. **1s. 6d.**
- BENARY (A. A.) Die römische Lautlehre sprachvergleichen dargestellt. Vol. I. (all published). svo. Berlin, 1837. **2s. 6d.**
- BERNHARDY (G.), Grundriss der Römischen Litteratur. 5. Bearbeitung. svo. Braunschweig, 1872. Calf. gilt. Mark Pattison's copy. **13s. 6d.**
- BIBLIA POLYGLOTTA, studio et labore E. Hutteri. In six languages, the first five of which: Hebrew, Chaldeæ, Greek, Latin and German, are the same in all editions, whilst the sixth varies according to the country for which the edition is intended. The following volumes are in stock: Pentateuchus, Sclaronice; Pentateuchus, Italice; Pentateuchus, Joshua, Judices, Ruth, Saxonice (i.e. Low German). All folio, Norimbergæ, 1599. *Hogskin and Vellum*, each **£1 1s.**
- The same. Gospels and Acts of the Apostles in Syriac, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, German, Bohemian, Italian, Spanish, French. English. Danish. Polish. Folio, Norimbergæ, 1599, Vellum. With large folding woodcut portrait of our Lord. **£1 5s.**
- Hebraice, Græce et Latine, cum annotationibus Fr. Vatabli. 2 Volumes. Folio, Heidelbergæ, 1587. Magnificent copy in stamped hogskin with clasps. **£2 2s.**
- BIBLIORUM SACRORUM LATINAE VERSIONES ANTIQUAE seu Vetus Italica, quæ cum Vulgata Latina, et cum Textu Græco comparantur. Acc. Præfationes, Observationes et Notæ, studio D. P. Sahatier, O.S.B. 3 volumes, folio, Paris, 1751. Very fine copy in mottled calf. **£16.**
- BIBLIA GRÆCÆ. Vetus Testamentum ex versione LXX Interpretum ed. Lamb. Bos. 4to. Francuæ, 1709. Maps. Vellum. **7s. 6d.**
- Novum Testamentum idiomate græco litterali et græco vulgari: et versione Musimi Calliopolitani. 2 vols. 4to. Genevæ, P. Chouet, 1698. Dutch Vellum, rare. **18s.**
- Another copy in calf. **15s.**
- Testamentum Novum Græcæ, tertium edidit Erasmus Roterodamus. Folio. Basilæ, 1523. Oak boards Wormed. **£1 1s.**
- BIBLIOTHECA GRÆCO-LATINA veterum Patrum antiquorumque Scriptorum ecclesiasticorum. cura et studio A. Gallandii. 14 vols. fol. Venetiis, 1765-88. Fine Copy in calf extra. **£50.**
- *.* Contains the works of 380 writers, of which 180 are not comprised in the earlier editions of the Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum.
- BLUM (K. L.) Herodot und Ktesias, die frühesten Geschichtsforscher des Orients. svo. Heidelberg, 1836. Half-bound. **2s.**
- BÖCKH (Aug.) Metrologische Untersuchungen über Gewichte, Münzmasse und Maasse des Alterthums. svo. Berlin, 1838. Half-bound. **5s.**
- BOETHII Consolatio philosophiæ; ejusd. opuscula sacra. Cum notis Jo. Bernardi, Theod. Sitzmanni et H. Vallini. svo. Lugduni, 1671. Sewed. **1s.**
- Consolation de la philosophie. Traduction grecque de Maxime Planude publ. par E. A. Bétant. svo. Genève, 1871. Sewed. **3s.**
- BÜTTCHER (Wilh.) Geschichte der Carthager. svo. Berlin, 1827. Map. Sewed. **5s.**
- BÜTTIGER (C. A.), Sabina oder Morgenszenen im Putzzimmer einer reichen Römerin. 2 vols. in 1. 12mo. Leipzig, 1806. 13 plates. Boards. **18s.**
- BRANDIS (Chr. Aug.) Handbuch der Geschichte der Griechisch-Römischen Philosophie. 3 vols. in 8. svo. Berlin, 1835-66. Half-calf, gilt. Fine Copy. **£2 2s.**
- BURLEY (Walter) Vitæ omnium philosophorum et poetarum cum auctoritatibus et sententiis aureis eorumdem annexis. 12mo. (Paris, Jean Petit), no date. Petit's device on title page. Old calf. **10s. 6d.**
- BURNEY (C.) Tentamen de metris ab Aeschylis in choricis cantibus adhibitis. svo, Cantabrigiæ, 1809. Half bound. **2s. 6d.**
- CAESARIS (C. JULII) Commentarii de bello gallico [et reliqua opera]. Small folio. Tarvisii, M. Manzolinus, 1450. Vellum. Very tall, perfectly sound and clean copy of this rare edition, a copy of which fetched £9 in the Sunderland sale. **£3 3s.**
- Commentarii, rec. optimorum codicum auctoritates annot. C. Nipperdeus. Editio major. svo. Lipsiæ, 1847. Calf. **£1 10s.**
- CALLIMACHI hymni, epigrammata et fragmenta. Græce et latine, c. notis variorum ed. Jo. Aug. Ernesti. 2 Vols. svo. Lugduni Bat. 1761. Old Calf. **4s. 6d.**
- CASSIODORI Opera omnia ed. D. J. Garetius. 2 vols. Fol. Rouen, 1679. Fine copy in old Calf. **18s.**
- CATULLI (C. Valerii) Carmina illustr. F. Guil. Doering, svo. Altona, 1834. Half-bound. **10s. 6d.**
- CERNOLA (Maj. Alex. Palma di), Antiquities excavated by him at Cyprus during the years 1876-1879. Oblong fol. London, 1881. 60 Photographic Plates containing upwards of 1000 subjects. Red morocco with clasp. **£1 10s.**
- CHASSANG (A.) Histoire du Roman et de ses rapports avec l'histoire dans l'antiquité grecque et latine. svo. Paris, 1862. Sewed. **4s.**
- CHRIST (W.) Grundzüge der griechischen Lautlehre. svo. Leipzig, 1859. Sewed. **4s.**
- CICERO (M. TULLIUS) Manuceiorum commentariis illustr. antiquaque lectioni restitutus. 10 vols. in 5. Folio. Venetiis, apud Aldos, 15-23. Vellum, red edges. **15s.**
- Epistolæ, rec. illustr. C. G. Schütz. 6 vols. svo. Halæ, 1809-12. Calf extra. **£1 1s.**
- another copy, 6 vols. in 3, half bound. **18s.**
- Epistles to Atticus, translated into English with notes by W. Guthrie. 2 vols. svo. London, 1752. Old calf. **1s. 6d.**
- Oratio pro Plancio, emend. et explan. Ed. Wunder. 4to. Lipsiæ, 1830. Calf. **5s.**

- CICERONIS Verrinarum libri VII., rec. et explic. C. T. Zumptius. Editio Major. 8vo, Berolini, 1831. Calf extra. **8s. 6d.**
- Brutus, rec., emend., interpretatus est F. Ellendt. 8vo. Regiomonti 1844. Calf extra. **4s. 6d.**
- De Oratore, rec. et explic. F. Ellendt. 2 vols. 8vo. Regiomonti, 1840. Calf. **14s. 6d.**
- De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum. Rec. et enarravit J. Nic. Madvigius. 8vo. Hauniae, 1839. Calf extra. **7s. 6d.**
- Laelius sive de amicitia. Mit Commentar von M. Seyffert. 8vo. Brandenburg, 1844. Calf extra. **3s.**
- Tusculanae Disputationes, cum notis variorum subque ed. G. H. Moser. 3 vols. 8vo. Hanover, 1836. Calf extra. **8s.**
- COMPTES-RENDUS de la Commission Impériale Archéologique pour les années 1859 à 1880. 20 vols. Text in small folio. Atlas in Royal folio. Petersburg, 1860-82. Complete as far as published. Rare. **£35.**
- CORNUTUS (L. Annaeus), de natura deorum rec. comm. lustr. F. Osannus. 8vo. Göttingae, 1814. Half Calf. Mark Pattison's copy. **8s. 6d.**
- Another copy in boards. **7s. 6d.**
- CORSEN (W.) Über Aussprache, Vokalismus und Betonung der lateinischen Sprache. Second Edition, 8vo, Leipzig, 1868. Half-calf gilt. 2 vols. **£4 4s.**
- COULANGES (Fustel de). La Cité antique. Etude sur le culte, le droit, les institutions de la Grèce et de Rome, Eighth Edition. 8vo, Paris, 1880. Cloth. **2s. 6d.**
- CREUZER (FRID.) Dionysii seu commentationes de rerum Bacchicarum Orphicarumque originibus et causis. Vol. I. (all published.) 4to. Heidelberg, 1809. 6 Plates. **3s. 6d.**
- Meletemata e disciplina antiquitatis. 3 vols. in one. 8vo. Leipzig, 1817. Half-bound. **5s.**
- Abriss der römischen Antiquitäten. Second Edition. 8vo. Leipzig, 1829. Boards. **1s.**
- CURTIIUS (E.) Attische Studien. 2 parts. Göttingen, 1862-65. 3 Plates.—WIESELER (F.) de loco, quo ante theatrum Bachi lapideum exstructum Athenis acti sint Iudi scenici. Göttingen, 1860.—SAUPE (H.) de demis urbanis Athenarum. Lipsiae, 1846.—CURTIUS (C.) das Metreon in Athen als Staatsarchiv. Berlin, 1868.—MÜLLER (C. O.) de Phidias vita et operibus. Plate. Göttingen, 1827. In 1 vol. 4to, cloth. **15s.**
- CURTIIUS RUFUS de rebus gestis Alexandri Magni rec. F. Schmieder. 8vo. Göttingae, 1803. Half-bound. **2s. 6d.**
- DALZEL (A.) Collectanea graeca maiora cum notis philologicis. Ed. VIII. 5 vols. 8vo. London, 1817. Calf. **3s.**
- DAMM (CH. T.) Novum lexicon graecum etymologicum et reale Homerici et Pindari. Editio nova cura Io. M. Duncan. 4to. Glasguae, 1824. Old calf. **5s.**
- DAWES (R.) Miscellanea critica iterum ed. Th. Burgess. 8vo. Oxonii, 1781. Boards. **2s.**
- DEMOSTHENIS Philippicae, ed. illustr. et indices adiecti C. A. Ruediger. 2 parts in 1 vol. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1829-33. Calf. **2s. 6d.**
- Oratio in Midiam, cum annot. eur. Phil. Buttmannus. 8vo. Berol. 1823. Half-bound. **1s.**
- DIONIS CHRYSOSTOMI Orationes, ex rec. J. J. Reiskii. Cum notis variorum et Morelli scholiis. 2 vols. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1798. Calf. **6s.**
- DIODORI SICULI Bibliothecae historicae libri qui supersunt, gr. et lat., interprete L. Rhodmano, recensuit P. Wesseling. 2 vols. folio. Amstelodami, 1746. Beautiful engraved frontispiece and portrait. Fine tall copy in calf. **15s.**
- DIONYSII HALICARNASSENSIS Antiquitatum Romanarum libri quotquot supersunt, graece et latine, ed. Joa. Hudson. 2 vols. folio. Oxoniae, 1704. Fine copy in calf. **12s. 6d.**
- DIOSCORIDIS libri octo, graece et latine. 12mo. Parisiis, P. Haultiunus, 1549. Half-bound. **3s. 6d.**
- DONALDSON (W.) Varronianus: a critical and historical introduction to the philological study of the Latin language. 8vo. Cambridge, 1848. Cloth. **2s.**
- DRUMANN (W.) Geschichte Roms in seinem Uebergang von der republicanischen zur monarchischen Verfassung. 6 vols. 8vo. Koenigsberg, 1834-41. Half calf gilt. Rare. **£3 15s.**
- DUCHALAIS (Ad.) Description des médailles gauloises faisant partie des collections de la Bibliothèque Royale. 8vo. Paris, 1846. 4 plates. **4s. 6d.**
- DÜNTZER (H.) Die Lehre von der lat. Wortbildung und Composition. Köln, 1836.—Ivers. Die Deklination der Indogermanischen Sprachen. Köln, 1839.—Schweschk (Konr.) Beitrag zur Wortforschung der lat. Sprache. 2 Thele. Frankfurt, 1833. In 1 vol. 8vo. Half bound. **3s. 6d.**
- ENGEL (W. H.) Kypros. 2 vols. 8vo. Berlin, 1841. Boards. **£1 1s.**
- EPICETI Enchiridium, una cum Cebeis tabula. Graece et lat. cum notis variorum auisque ed. A. Berkelius. 8vo. Delphis Batav., 1683. Vellum. **5s. 6d.**
- EPIGRAMMATUM Graecarum libri VII, graece, annotationibus Joa. Brodiaei illustrati. Folio, Basilienae 1549. Calf. **8s. 6d.**
- [EPIGRAMMATA.] Sylloge epigrammatum Graecarum, collecti F. Th. Welcker. With appendix and plate, 8vo. Bonn, 1828-29. Half-calf. **3s. 6d.**
- ERNESTI (F. Ch. Th.) Lexicon technologiae Latinorum rhetoricae. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1797. Calf. **5s.**
- ETYMOLOGICON MAGNUM. Graece cum praefatione Musuri. Fol. Venetiis (Zacharias Calligri) 1499. Old red Russia, rebeked. **£6 6s.**
- *. Remarkably fine and tall copy in first-rate interior preservation. Formerly in the library of *Sadoleto*, whose autograph appears on the title-page. With the book plate of the Marquis of Wellesley, to whom the copy was presented by B. Sydenham, "in token of his constant kindness and favour to Thomas Sydenham."
- EURIPIDIS Tragoediae, ed. A. Witzschel. 3 vols. 8vo. Lipsiae, B. Tauchnitz, 1855. Cloth ancant. Vellum paper. Out of print. **10s. 6d.**
- Tragoediae, rec. et commentariis instr. A. J. E. Pflugk. Vol. I. II. (Medea—Hecuba—Andromache—Heraclidae—Helenus—Alcestis—Hercules furens—Phoenissae). 8vo. Gotha, 1890-91. Calf. **3s. 6d.**
- Tragoediae priores quatuor (Hecuba, Orestes, Phoenissae, Medea) cum notis Ric. Porson auisque ed. J. Scholefield. 8vo. Cantabrigiae, 1829. Boards. uncant. **2s. 6d.**
- Heraclidae et Medea, ex recens. P. Elmsley cum notis variorum. Ed. II. 8vo. Oxoniae, 1828. Calf. **3s.**
- Helena. Rec. God. Hermannus. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1837. Half-bound. **1s. 6d.**
- [—] DINDORF (Guil.) Animadversiones in Euripidis tragoedias. 2 vols., 8vo. Oxonii, 1839-40. Boards. uncant. **4s.**
- FABRICII (J. A.) Bibliotheca Graeca. 14 vols. in 8. 4to. Hamburg. 1705-28. Vellum. **£1 5s.**
- FESTI quae supersunt, cum Pauli epitome, emendata et annotata a C. O. Mueller. Oblong 4to. Lips., 1839. Half-bound. Rare. **£1 16s.**
- FETES et Courtisanes de la Grèce. Supplement au Voyages d'Anacharsis et d'Antenor, comprenant la chronique religieuse des anciens Grecs, la chronique scandaleuse, un Almanach Athénien, etc. 4th edition 4 vols., 8vo. Paris, 1821. Plates and Music. Half-bound. **£1 1s.**
- FLORI (L. Andrei) Epitome rerum Romanarum cum notis variorum auisque ed. C. A. Duker. 8vo. Lugduni Bat., 1732. Dutch vellum. **3s.**
- Another Copy in Old Calf. **2s. 6d.**
- FORCHHAMMER (P. W.) Hellenika. Griechenland im neuen das alte. Bd. I (all published.) 8vo. Berlin, 1837. Plate and Maps. Sewed. **3s.**
- FOURTOUL (H.) Etudes d'archéologie et d'histoire. 2 vols. 8vo. Paris, 1854. Sewed. **4s. 6d.**
- FRENSDORFF (Emile) Etudes sur Eschyle. T. I. 8vo. Bruxelles, 1846. Sewed. **1s. 6d.**
- FRITSCH (E.A.) Vergleichende Bearbeitung der griechischen und lateinischen Partikeln. 8vo. Giessen, 1856-58. Sewed. **3s.**
- GELLI (Auli) Noctes Atticae cum selectis novisque commentariis ex accurata rec. A. Thysi et J. Oiseli. 8vo. Lugduni Bat. 1666. Calf. **3s.**
- Noctes Atticae cum annotationibus ed. Lion. 2 vols. 8vo. Goettingae, 1824. Half Calf. **4s.**
- GIDEL (A. Ch.) Etudes sur la littérature grecque moderne. 8vo. Paris, 1866. Sewed. **7s. 6d.**

- GLADISCH (Aug.) Empedocles und die Aegypter. Mit Erläuterungen von H. Brugsch und J. Passalacqua. 8vo. Leipzig, 1858. Sewed. **2s. 6d.**
- GREGORII (S., Turonensis) Opera omnia; necnon Fredegarii Scholastici Epitome et Chronicon. Studio Dom. Th. Ruinart. fol. Lutetiae Paris., 1699. Calf. **£1 16s.**
- HAGEN (H.) Zur Geschichte der Philologie und zur ionischen Literatur. 8vo. Berlin, 1879. **4s. 6d.**
- HEGEWISCH (D. H.) Historischer Versuch über die römischen Finanzen. 8vo. Altona, 1804. **1s.**
- HEIMSOETH (Friedr.) Kritische Studien zu den griech. Tragikern. Abtheil. I. (all published.) 8vo. Bonn, 1865. Sewed. **3s. 6d.**
- HERMANN (Gotfr.) Opuscula. 8 vols. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1827-77. Half calf. **£2 2s.**
- HERODOTI historiarum libri ix, opera F. W. Reizii. 2 vols. 8vo. Oxonii, 1808. Half-bound. **3s. 6d.**
- historiarum libri ix, opera F. W. Reizii. 2 vols. 16mo. Londini, 1822. Boards, uncut. **2s. 6d.**
- HERWERDEN (Henricus van): Nova addenda critica ad Meinekii fragmenta Comicorum graecorum.—Plutarchae et Lucianae.—Oratio de moribus Graecorum aetate Homerica.—Lapidum de dialecto Attica testimonia. 8vo. Trajecti ad Rh., 1804-80. Each **1s. 6d.**
- HESIODE quae extant, ex rec. Th. Robinsoni, cum notis variorum ed. Ch. F. Loesner. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1778. Calf. **2s.**
- Carmina, rec. et annot. C. Goettling. 8vo. Gottingae, 1843. Cloth. **3s.**
- HESYCHII Milesii opuscula duo et Cardinalis BESARIONIS epistola de educandis filijs Jo. Palaeologi, graece et latine, ed. J. C. Orelli. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1820. Half calf. **3s. 6d.**
- HILDEBERTI (Ven.) Opera, acc. MARBODI Opuscula, ed. D. Ant. Beaugendre. Folio. Paris, 1708. Old calf. Best Benedictine edition. **15s.**
- HOECK (Karl) Kreta von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf die Römer-Herrschaft. 3 vols. 8vo. Göttingen, 1823-29. Half bound. Map and two plates. **£1 1s.**
- HOFFMANN (S. J. W.) Griechenland und die Griechen im Alterthum. 2 vols. 8vo. Leipzig, 1841. Half bound. **6s.**
- HOMERI Ilias et Odyssea, ex recogn. Imm. Bekkeri. 2 vols. in 1. 8vo. Berolini, 1843. Calf. **4s. 6d.**
- Carmina. I. Bekker emendabat et annotabat. 2 vols. 8vo. Bonn, 1858. Cloth. **7s. 6d.**
- Ilias cum lectionibus, scholiis et versione latina ed. C. G. Heyne. 8 vols. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1802. Calf. **10s. 6d.**
- Die Homerische Odyssee in ihrer ursprünglichen Sprachform wiederhergestellt. Von A. Fick. 8vo. Göttingen, 1883. Sewed. **9s.**
- HORATIUS, Satiren erklärt von L. F. Heindorf. 8vo. Reutlingen, 1818. Half bound. **1s.**
- HÜBNER (Aemilius), Inscriptiones Hispaniae Christianae. 4to. Berolini, 1871. Cum tabula geogr. Boards. **6s.**
- HUSCHKE (Ph. E.) Das alte römische Jahr und seine Tage. (Römische Studien, I.) 8vo. Breslau, 1869. **3s.**
- IRENAEI (S., Episcopi Lugd.) Opera, studio et labore R. Massuet, O.S.B. 2 vols. fol. Venetis, 1734. Calf. Best Edition. **£1 15s.**
- ISIDORI (S., Hispalensis Episc.) Opera omnia denuo correcte et aucta, rec. F. Arevalo, qui Isidoriana praemisit etc. 7 vols. 4to. Romae, 1797. Spanish calf. **£4 4s.**
- JÖCHER (C. G.) Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexicon. 4 vols. 4to. Leipzig, 1750-51. Vellum. **£1 1s.**
- Indispensable to every philological, historical and theological library.
- JONGH (A. de) Pindarica. 8vo. Trajecti ad Rh., 1845. Calf. **3s.**
- JULIANI (Imperatoris) Opera, Graece et Latine. 4to. Paris, 1620. Vellum. **3s. 6d.**
- JURIS CIVILIS ANTEJUSTINIANEI reliquiae ineditae cur. Ang. Maio. 8vo. Romae, 1823. Half calf. **2s. 6d.**
- JUSTINI (Martyris) Opera omnia, gr. et lat. Ed. Bened. fol. Paris, 1742. Calf. **£1 5s.**
- JUVENALIS Opus, interprete Joa. Britannico cum Joa. Badii familiaribus explanationibus. Folio. Venetis, Fr. Bindoni et M. Pasini, 1513. Curious wood engravings. Vellum. **7s. 6d.**
- JUVENALIS Satirae. Item Auli PERSII satirarum liber. Cum notis variorum et commentario Is. Casauboni. 4to. Lugduni Bat., 1693. Dutch vellum. **8s. 6d.**
- Satirae, illustr. G. A. Ruperti. 2 vols. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1819. Cloth, uncut. **6s.**
- Satirae, cum commentariis C. T. Heurichii. Aeced. scholia vetera. 2 vols in 1. 8vo. Bonnæ, 1839. Half-morocco. **9s.**
- Satirae, cum scholiis veteribus et emend. O. Jahn. 8vo. Berolini, 1851. Cloth, uncut. **£1 10s.**
- Thirteen Satires, ed. with English notes by J. E. B. Mayor. 8vo. Cambridge, 1853. Cloth. **3s. 6d.**
- In Juvenalis Satiras Commentarii vetusti, notis instr. D. A. G. Cramer. 8vo. Hamburg, 1823. Boards. **2s. 6d.**
- KÖNE (J. R.) Über die Sprache der römischen Epiker. 8vo. Münster, 1841. Sewed. **1s. 6d.**
- KORTÜM (F.) Zur Geschichte hellenischer Staatsverfassungen hauptsächlich während des peloponnesischen Kriegs. 8vo. Heidelberg, 1831. Half-bound. **1s. 6d.**
- KRAUSE (J. H.) Angelologie. Die Gefässe der alten Völker insbesondere der Griechen und Römer. 8vo. Halle, 1854. 6 plates. Cloth. **7s. 6d.**
- KRISCHKE (Aug. B.) Die theologischen Lehren der griechischen Denker. Eine Prüfung der Darstellung Cicero's 8vo. Göttingen, 1840. Cloth. **4s. 6d.**
- KREUSER (J.) Der Hellenen Priesterstaat mit vorzüglichem Rücksicht auf die Hierodulen. 8vo. Mainz, 1822. Sewed. **1s. 6d.**
- KRÜGER (G. T. A.) Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiet der lateinischen Sprachlehre, 3 parts. 8vo. Braunschweig, 1820-7. Sewed. **2s. 6d.**
- KRUSE (F. C. H.) Hellas oder geographisch-antiquarische Darstellung des alten Griechenlands und seiner Colonien. 2 vols. in 3. 8vo. Leipzig, 1825-27. Plates and Maps. Half-bd. **8s. 6d.**
- KÜHNER (R.) Schulgrammatik der griechischen Syntax. Third Edition. 8vo. Hannover, 1851. Cloth. **1s.**
- LABOULAYE (E.) Essai sur les lois criminelles des Romains concernant la responsabilité des magistrats. 8vo. Paris, 1845. Half-bound. Rare. Mark Pattison's copy. **10s. 6d.**
- LACHMANN (R. H.) Die spartanische Staatsverfassung in ihrer Entwicklung und ihrem Verfall. 8vo. Breslau, 1856. Sewed. **3s.**
- LANZI (L.) Saggio di lingua Etrusca e di altre antiche lingue d'Italia. 3 vols. 12mo. Roma, 1789. Half bound. **8s. 6d.**
- LAUER (J. F.) System der griechischen Mythologie. 8vo. Berlin, 1853. Boards. **4s. 6d.**
- LE GRIS (Jules) Rome, ses novateurs, ses conservateurs et la monarchie d'Octave Auguste. Etudes historiques sur Lucrèce, Catulle, Virgile, Horace. 2 vols. 8vo. Paris, 1846. Half bound. **3s. 6d.**
- LERSCH (Laur.) Antiquitates Vergilianae ad vitam populi Romani descriptae. 8vo. Bonnæ, 1843. Half calf. **3s.**
- Die Sprachphilosophie der Alten. 3 vols. in 1. 8vo. Bonn, 1853-41. Half bound. **12s. 6d.**
- LETRONNE, Mélanges d'érudition et de critique historique, 8vo. Paris (1850). Portrait. Sewed. **3s. 6d.**
- LIVII (Titi) Historiarum libri qui supersunt, adjunctis scholiis C. Sigonii. Ed. II. Folio. Venetis, 1569. Calf. **5s. 6d.**
- LUCANI Pharsalia, cum Scholiaste et notis variorum cur. F. Oudendorpius. 4to. Lugduni Bat., 1724. Calf. **8s. 6d.**
- LUCIANI Samosatensis Opera omnia quae extant, graece et latine, cum notis Bourdelotii et aliorum. Folio. Lutetiae Paris, 1615. Calf. **10s. 6d.**
- Opera, cum nova vers. lat. Hemsterhusii et Gesneri, scholiis et notis variorum ed. Tib. Hemsterhusii et J. F. Reitzius. Aeced. Lexicon Lucianum a C. G. Reitzio. 4 vols. 4to. Amstelodami et Trajecti ad Rh. 1745-46. Calf. **£1 1s.**
- Opera, ed. Guil. Dindorf. 3 vols. 12mo. Lipsiae, 1858. Sewed. **3s. 6d.**
- LUCRETIVUS, de rerum natura, rec. et emend. commentario instr. C. Lachmann. 2 vols. in 1. 8vo. Berolini 1850. Cloth, uncut. **5s.**

- LYCOPHRONIS** *Alexandra* cum versione latina et comm. Guil. Canteri, illustr. H. G. Reichard. 8vo. Lips., 1753. —Jo. et Is. Tsetzæ Scholia in Lycophronem, emend. et illustr. Ch. G. Müller. 3 vols. 8vo. Lipsiæ, 1811. Half calf gilt. **£1 10s**
- LYCURGI** *Oratio contra Leocratem*, rec., ill. A. Korai, Gallicam versionem addidit F. Th. 8vo. Paris, 1826. Russia, uncut. One of the scarcest vols. of the Korai Collection. **8s.**
- LYSIAE** quae supersunt, Graece, cum Taylori Marklandi suisque annotationibus ed. J. J. Reiske. 2 vols. 8vo. Lipsiæ, 1772. Boards. **9s. 6d.**
- *Orationes et fragmenta, annotatione critica instr.* Jo. Franz. 8vo. Stuttgart, 1831. Calf. **2s.**
- MACROBII** *Opera*, cum notis J. Pontani, J. Meursii, Jac. Gronovii. 8vo. Lugduni Bat., 1670. Calf. **5s.**
- MADVIG** (J. N.) *Syntax der griechischen Sprache*. 8vo. Braunschweig, 1847. Bds. **2s. 6d.**
- MÄRKER** (F. A.), *Das Princip des Bösen nach den Begriffen der Griechen*. 8vo. Berlin, 1842. Half Calf. **5s. 6d.**
- MARTHA** (C.) *Les moralistes sous l'empire Romain. Philosophes et poètes*. 8vo. Paris, 1865. Sewed. **3s. 6d.**
- MARTIALIS** *Epigrammaton libri*, ed. D. F. G. Schneidewin. 2 vols. in one. 8vo. Grima, 1842. Half Calf gilt. **10s. 6d.**
- MARTIANUS** *CAPELLA de nuptiis philologiae et Mercurii et de septem artibus liberalibus* ed. cum notis variorum et commentario perpetuo U. F. Kopp. 4to. Francofurti, 1836. Half Calf. **7s. 6d.**
- MATTHES** (H. J.), *Disputatio literaria de Epaminonda*. 4to. Lugduni Bat., 1830. **1s. 6d.**
- MENANDRI et PHILEMONIS** *Reliquiae, graece et latine*, cum notis H. Grotii et J. Clerici. 8vo. Amstelodami, 1709. Half bound. **1s. 6d.**
- MÉNARD** (M.), *Histoire des antiquités de la ville de Nîmes et de ses environs*. 8vo. Nîmes, 1819. 14 Plates. Sewed. **1s.**
- MERCKLIN** (L.), *Die Coorperation der Römer. Eine saecralrechtliche Abhandlung*. 8vo. Mitau, 1848. Sewed. **1s. 6d.**
- METZGER** (G. C.), *Memoria Hieron. Wolfii*. 8vo. Augustae Vind. 1862. Vellum. **1s. 6d.**
- MOMMSEN** (Th.) *Res gestae Divi Augusti. Ex monumentis Ancyranis et Apolloniensibus editae*. Roy. 8vo. Berol., 1865. 3 plates. Cloth. **4s. 6d.**
- MUSEUM der Alterthumswissenschaft, herausgegeben von F. A. Wolf und Phil. Buttmann. 2 vols. 8vo. Berlin 1807-8. 4 plates. **3s.****
- NEUBAEUSER** (J.) *Cadmilus sive de Cabiromum cultu ac mysteriis*. 8vo. Lipsiæ 1857. Sewed. **1s. 6d.**
- NICANDRI** *Theriaca et Alexipharmaca*, Jo. Gorgaeus latinis versibus reddidit, italicis vero A. M. Salviniis. Cum graeca Euteeni metaphrasi ed. A. M. Bandinius. 8vo. Florentiae, 1764. Calf. **3s.**
- NIEBUHR** (B. G.) *Vorträge über alte Länder- und Völkerkunde*, gehalten zu Bonn, herausgegeben von M. Isler. 8vo. Berlin, 1851. Calf. **4s. 6d.**
- *Vorträge über alte Geschichte*, zu Bonn gehalten, herausg. von M. Niebuhr. 3 vols. 8vo. Berlin, 1847-51. Calf. **12s. 6d.**
- NONNI** *Dionysiacorum libri sex* (VIII.—XIII.), illustr. G. H. Moser. Praefatus est F. Creuzer. 8vo. Heidelberg, 1809. Calf. **2s. 6d.**
- ORIGENIS** *Opera omnia*, gr. et lat., ed. H. Lommatsch. 25 vols in 12. 12mo. Berolini, 1834-40. Half calf gilt. Fine copy. **£4 14s. 6d.**
- *Hexaplorum quae supersunt. Gr. et lat. Notis illustr. D. B. de Montfaucon*. 2 vols. fol. Paris, 1713. French calf. **£1 16s.**
- *contra Celsum libri VIII. et Gregorii Thaumaturgi Panegyricus in Origenem, Graece et Latine*, ed. D. Hoerschel. 4to. Augsburg, 1665. Calf. **3s. 6d.**
- ORPHEI** *Opera, graece et latine, cum notis et indice* cur. G. C. Hamberger. 8vo. Lipsiæ, 1764. Calf. **1s. 6d.**
- OVIDII** *Opera. Cum notis variorum*. 3 vols. 8vo. Lugduni Bat., 1663-70. Calf. **10s. 6d.**
- *Metamorphoses, rec. et illustr. G. E. Gierig*. 2 vols. 8vo. Lipsiæ, 1804-7. Sewed. **7s. 6d.**
- PERSII** *Satirae, rec. et comment. instr.* N. L. Achaintre. 8vo. Paris, 1812. Morocco. **3s.**
- *Satirae, cum scholiis antiquis* ed. Otto Jahn. 8vo. Lipsiæ, 1843. Calf. **£1 16s.**
- PETRONII** *Satyricon, cum notis variorum* cur. P. Burmannus. 4to. Trajecti ad Rh. 1709. Calf. **7s. 6d.**
- [—] *Chrestomathia Petronio-Burmanniæ, accessit specimen latinis novae, Romanis incognitae e notis P. Burmanni ad Petronium*. 8vo. Florentiae, 1784. Half-bd. Satirical pamphlet against Burmann. **2s. 6d.**
- PHAEDRI** *fabulae Aesopicae, cum novo commentario* P. Burmanni. Roy. 4to. Leidae, 1777. Vellum. Fine copy on large paper. **5s.**
- *Fabulae Aesopicae, ed. illustr. J. G. S. Schwabe*. 2 vols. 8vo. Brunsvigae, 1866. Calf. **4s. 6d.**
- PHOTII** *Patriarchi lectionum collectio, e codice Galeano descriptis R. Porsonis*. (Ed. P. Dobree.) 2 vols. 8vo. Cantabrigiae, 1822. Boards, uncut. **5s. 6d.**
- PHRANTZES** (G.) *Io. Cananus, Io. Anagnostes, ex recens. Imm. Bekkeri*. 8vo. Bonn, 1838. Half calf. **5s. 6d.**
- PINDARI** *carmina ex rec. Boeckhii* ed. L. Dissen. Ed. II. cur. F. G. Schneidewin. Sect. I. cont. textum cum annotatione critica. **3s. 6d.**
- PINDAROS'** *Werke in die Versmaasse des Originals übersetzt von Jo. Tycho Mommsen*. 4to. Leipsa, 1846. Calf. **3s. 6d.**
- [—] *Kayser (C. L.) Lectiones Pindaricae*. 8vo. Heidelberg, 1840. Calf. **1s. 6d.**
- PLATO'S** *Apology of Socrates, Crito and Phaedo*. With the Latin version of Ficinus and notes by C. Stuart Stanford. 8vo. Dublin, 1834. Calf. **3s.**
- *Euthydemus et Gorgias, rec., latine vertit, notaque adj. M. J. Routh*. 8vo. Oxonii, 1784.—Ejusd. *Parmenides, graece et latine, studio J. G. Thomson*. 8vo. Oxonii, 1728.—Ejusd. *V dialogi (Amatores, Eutyphron, Apologia, Crito, Phaedon)*; illustr. N. Forster. 8vo. Oxonii, 1765. In 2 vols. Calf. **3s.**
- [—] *Chaignet (A. Ed.) De la psychologie de Platon*. 8vo. Paris, 1862. Half mor. **3s. 6d.**
- PLAUTI** *Amphitruo—Aulularia—Asinaria, rec. et illustr. E. J. Richter*. 3 vols. 8vo. Norimb. 1833. Calf. **4s. 6d.**
- *Comodiae tres. Captivi. Miles gloriosus. Trinummus*. Edidit F. Lindemann. Ed. II. 8vo. Lipsiæ, 1844. Half bound. **4s. 6d.**
- *Trinummus, Captivi, Menæchmi, erklärt von J. Brix*. 8vo. Leipzig, 1870-73. Half-bound, interleaved. **2s. 6d.**
- *Miles Gloriosus, Mostellaria, erklärt von A. O. Fr. Lorenz*. 8vo. Berlin, 1863-66. Half bound, interleaved. **3s. 6d.**
- PLINII SECUNDI** (C.) *Naturalis Historiae libri XXXVII, interpretatione et notis illustr. J. Harduinus, S.J. In usum Delphini*. 5 vols. 4to. Parisiis, 1685. Calf. **18s.**
- *Naturalis Historia, cum notis variorum*. 3 vols. 8vo. Lugduni Bat., 1669. Calf. **7s. 6d.**
- POETAE LATINI MINORES**, cur. J. Ch. Wernsdorf. 6 vols. in 10. 8vo. Helmestadii, 1791-99. Half-bound. **£2 2s.**
- POETAE LYRICI GRAECI**. Ed. Theod. Bergk. 8vo. Lipsiæ, 1843. Calf. **5s.**
- POLLUX** (Julius) *Vocabularium, Graece. Folio. Venetiis, apud Aldum 1502*. Calf. Tall, sound and clean copy of the editio princeps. **£1 1s.**
- PROPERTII** *Elegiae, cum commentario perpetuo* P. Burmanni Secundi et variorum ed. L. Santenius. 4to. Trajecti ad Rh., 1780. Calf, gilt edges. Bound in 2 vols. **7s. 6d.**
- RANGABÉ** (A. R.). *Antiquités Helléniques ou repertoire d'inscriptions et d'autres antiquités découvertes depuis l'affranchissement de la Grèce*. 2 vols. 4to. Athens, 1842-55. Half-morocco. **£3 3s.**
- REINHOLD** (C. H. Th.). *Noctes Pelasgicae vel symbolae ad cognoscendas dialectos Graeciae Pelasgicas*. 8vo. Athenis, 1885. Half-bound. **1s. 6d.**
- RITSCHL** (Fr.). *Opuscula philologica*. 5 vols. in 6, and atlas of 25 plates. 8vo. Leipzig, 1867-79. Half-calf, gilt. **£4 4s.**